

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 1877.

The Week.

THE Maine Republicans nominated Governor Conner for re-election, and adopted a series of resolutions, some of which were almost long enough for political treatises on their respective subjects. Their character may be gathered from the opening sentences of the first, second, and fourth, as follows: "The United States constitute a nation and not a mere confederacy," "Citizenship is national," "Most kind and fraternal relations should be cultivated between all sections of our common country." None of them are of any importance until we come to the eighth, which contains a vigorous "demand that in the resumption of specie payment the promise of the national Government be kept in an honest, straightforward manner, and that no backward or sideway step be taken." The ninth opposes any radical change in the navigation laws, and "any further land-grants or subsidies for railroads by the general Government." The tenth affirms that "the States of South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana were fairly and legally carried by the Republicans at the November election of 1876 for State and national tickets." The rest relate to local affairs. Ex-Governor Chamberlain, now president of Bowdoin College, proposed the adoption of a rather mild resolution of approval of Mr. Hayes, which was met by another declaring that the failure of the Government to recognize Packard and Chamberlain placed it "in the humiliating attitude of surrendering to rebels." A somewhat stormy debate followed, but Mr. Blaine acted the peacemaker by enquiring, "Shall one man be compelled to swallow the opinions of the other? Shall not each have the liberty to cherish his own?" and moved that both resolutions be put upon the table, which was done, and the Convention harmoniously adjourned. The Democratic Convention, which met on the 14th, adopted a platform of only three resolutions, of no special import, and nominated Mr. J. H. Williams for Governor.

The State of Virginia in 1871 provided for the payment of two-thirds of her indebtedness by inducing her creditors to accept bonds with coupons receivable for taxes. These bonds amount to about \$20,000,000. The remainder of her debt, about \$10,000,000, was left unprovided for until some settlement could be effected with the new State of West Virginia. Upon this portion of the debt no interest is now paid or has been for some time, although no one disputes its justness, and it is held principally by widows and orphans whose money has been invested in it by order of the State courts. In 1872 the Legislature repealed the bill which provided for the receipt of the coupons for taxes. A case was immediately made up, however, and decided in favor of the bondholders, and, despite energetic efforts subsequently made by Governor Kemper and others to get rid of a portion of this debt by some short and practical method, the bondholders have persistently held on to their bonds, have paid their taxes with the coupons, and have stubbornly refused to consent to any new bargain with the State. For some time past it has been evident that the answer to the question, What shall be done with the public debt? would probably be the rock upon which factions would split at the next Democratic Convention, especially as Mahone, one of the aspirants for the Governorship and described as an aggressive and energetic man, had declared that the creditors of the State must be made to agree to a readjustment of the debt.

When the Convention met on the 8th the delegates, more than 1,400 in number, had become so excited upon the subject of the State's indebtedness that even the mention of the words debt and taxes acted upon them like a red rag, and it was almost im-

possible to transact any business. The temporary chairman, attempting to express an opinion upon the exciting theme, was actually howled down and compelled to desist. After a three days' turbulent session, Colonel F. W. M. Holliday, a Winchester lawyer and strong opponent of repudiation, was nominated for Governor, by the aid, however, of Mahone and his followers, and an "adjustment" plank, not a very strong one, was put into the platform. It should be added that Holliday is said to be opposed to any increase of taxation though without it payment of the State's debt is impossible. There is no excuse whatever for the repudiation fever which has recently obtained so strong a hold upon the farmers and planters of Virginia. The debt was legally contracted, and the taxes are not burdensome. The unanimity with which all hands disclaim the dishonorable project of repudiation, and the earnestness with which at the same time a large number are advocating "readjustment" as something entirely consistent with honor, is most absurd. Experience, however, is fast teaching us that a State's sense of honor does not necessarily include the idea of paying its debts.

The Georgia Constitutional Convention has given the bondholders of the State what appears to be a *coup de grâce* by repudiating all the securities in dispute. From the accounts given in the newspapers, it seems that this was not done through any misunderstanding of the nature of the bondholders' claims. The matter was thoroughly discussed, and many of the leading men of the State opposed the repudiating clause. Toombs, however, came to the rescue of the repudiators, and declared that all the bonds were inherently void, having been issued by a "usurping" government. Toombs probably knows what some of his constituents do not know, that there is no principle of public law and morals better settled than that, for purposes of credit, the government of a State is continuous; and that in civilized communities, when one class or interest succeeds in ousting another, even though that other may have been revolutionary and illegal in character, the utmost care is taken by the incoming power to protect the rights of creditors who have relied on the promises of the *de facto* rulers. Of course the idea that the carpet-bag governments were illegal or revolutionary is absurd. On the same grounds demagogues of the Toombs stripe might advocate the repudiation of the national debt on their old theory that the Union ceased to exist on the secession of the Southern States—as, indeed, we have no doubt they would if they got a chance. The main question now for the holders of the securities of such States as Minnesota and Georgia is, What can be done about it? There seems to be no resource except open and persistent exposure. Debtors who refuse not only to pay their debts but to give their creditors a hearing, are no better than common cheats, whether they be individuals or States; and as such they ought to be exposed and disgraced throughout the civilized world. It ought to be known by every one who has a dollar to invest, and by every emigrant who thinks of seeking a new home on this side of the Atlantic, that, in addition to the usual risks he runs, there is in such States as these one more—that the sense of good faith is benumbed, if not dead, and that he is making himself one of a community of swindlers. As we suggested some time ago, the Stock Exchange ought to wipe the securities of fraudulent States off their lists, as they do those of swindling corporations.

If the Republican party expects to hold on to the workingmen by demagogical tactics it must make up its mind to go a great deal further than it proposed to go in the Ohio platform. Conventions or mass-meetings of workingmen have been held in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Columbus, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and perhaps in other places within the last ten days, and some of the speeches made and resolutions adopted show the feebleness, from a labor-reformer's point of view, of the Ohio Republicans' attempt to meet the issue.

The Cincinnati gathering, for instance, demanded, among other things, the abolition of all conspiracy laws; gratuitous instruction in all educational institutions; prohibition of convict labor; repeal of all patent laws; the control by Government of all railroads and telegraphs; and the management by co-operative unions under Government control of all kinds of industrial enterprises. On this platform a State ticket was nominated. Judge West and Mr. Stanley Matthews can hardly employ their time for a few weeks to come to any better advantage than by reading carefully and reflecting seriously upon the newspaper reports of these workingmen's meetings.

On Friday last Senator Conkling returned from Europe on the *Nectar*, and was welcomed by a band of patriots, among whom we notice some of our most prominent appraisers, postmasters, weighers, gaugers, and inspectors. It shows how little the new civil-service rules have cooled political zeal that the first man to climb over the side of the ship and welcome back New York's Favorite Son was no less a person than Mr. Silas B. Dutcher, the appraiser, lately reduced to slavery by his exclusion from participation in ward politics. Mr. Conkling is described as being "the picture of health," and must be in good spirits, too, for he came up the bay waving a small American flag to the accompanying delegation from the Custom-house and Post-office. He conversed very kindly with the reporters, complimented the captain of the ship on his behavior, and repeated an interesting if somewhat ungrammatical meteorological prediction that he had made to him—that "the further we get from Europe and the closer we approach America we will have no fogs." And so, he continued, it was, "for as we neared our own soil the American bird seemed to scatter the nebula with its wings, and eternal sunshine settled on our heads." In the evening the Senator was serenaded and made a speech, which was printed in full in all the papers of Saturday. He dwelt with feeling on the dangers to which he had been exposed on the stormy deep, when, as he beautifully described it, he had been "tossing in chill winds and rains on foaming seas, sometimes in the sweep of polar currents," and expressed his gratitude to the North German Lloyds, their officers and men, for his safe return; declared he was never so proud of his country as when abroad; and that he had been "amazed to find so little to envy" in foreign institutions. He then compared, in a brief but masterly way, English civilization with our own, pointing out that we were ahead in hotels, while in rapid transit London was more advanced than New York. He next referred to the magnanimity of Germany and the Germans in their dealings with France, and gave a glowing picture of General Grant in Europe, predicting that the honors now lavished upon him would not wipe out "a jot of his Americanism," or make him anything save the "same upright, downright American, without cant or palaver—the same modest, unpretending citizen" he has ever been.

One W. B. Moore, Chief of the Special Agents of the Treasury Department, was recently removed from office for cause, notwithstanding President Grant had made a particular request that he be retained. Moore conceived that Gen. H. V. Boynton, the Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, had a hand in his dismissal, and accordingly published a statement accusing the latter of surreptitiously procuring papers from the files of the Department relating to himself (Moore), and then seeking to blackmail him by threatening to publish them. Gen. Boynton replies that he has never had any communication with Moore directly or indirectly; that he has never received any papers relating to Moore from the files of the Treasury Department, and that Moore's removal from office was caused by the discovery of papers showing that while the San Domingo affair was under investigation by the Senate, Moore conspired with Babcock, Whitley, and Nettleship (afterwards of safe-burglary notoriety), to kidnap an obnoxious witness, a citizen of Rhode Island, and carry him off to Texas on a false charge of murder; that Moore actually manufactured the affidavit of the alleged murder, and with it obtained from the Governor of Rhode Island a requisition to arrest and remove this person, intending to

keep him in custody till the investigation was ended. When these documents were found by the present Administration, Moore was summarily discharged, and it has since transpired that he was the discoverer of the notorious "Bristow conspiracy" to blacken the name of General Grant by getting up an unnecessary prosecution of the distillers, and wickedly procuring the indictment of the President's private secretary. That Moore's correspondence with General Grant was largely if not chiefly instrumental in bringing about the retirement of Secretary Bristow from the Cabinet and of Bluford Wilson from the Treasury, and the removal of all persons who had distinguished themselves in any way in bringing the Whiskey Ring to justice, is now generally believed in Washington. It is to be hoped that General Boynton will make a fuller disclosure of these facts in the interest of historical truth. Cabinets have been unmade in other times and places by spies and informers, but by none, within our recollection, of so low a grade as this one.

One of the movers in the kidnapping affair, according to Gen. Boynton's statement, was Gen. Babcock, the negotiator of the San Domingo treaty. When this officer of the army was under indictment at St. Louis, an "interview" with General Sherman was published in one of the newspapers of that city, in which the General was reported as saying that he did not believe Babcock was guilty of complicity in the whiskey frauds; but whether he was or not, he would have to answer those charges at some future time before a tribunal where the technicalities of the criminal law would not avail him. This was accepted by the public as an intimation that his character as an officer and a gentleman, and his fitness to hold a permanent command over others, would be reviewed by a military court. So much time has since elapsed as to suggest that possibly the tribunal alluded to was the Last Judgment. It is not to be supposed that the whole world has joined in a conspiracy to crush an innocent and obscure person of the name of Babcock, by connecting him successively with the whiskey frauds, the Washington safe-burglary, the Black Friday conspiracy, false measuring of street pavements, and the kidnapping of a witness on a false charge of murder; and it is of some importance to the *morale* of the army and to the character of future graduates at West Point that the standard of fitness for a military commission should be something higher than ability to steer clear of the penitentiary. Gen. Babcock should be either vindicated or cashiered; and if the superior officers of the army cannot find an excuse for beginning the task, it will be incumbent upon Congress to take the initiative.

An important engagement with the Nez-Percés took place on Friday, this time within the limits of Montana. The Indians had retreated from General Howard's front to the Bitter Root Mountains by way of Elk City. They crossed into the valley of the Big Hole, and encamped on the northern edge of the prairie of that name on the night of the 8th inst. Here they were overtaken by General Gibbon's command, consisting of 150 soldiers and 32 citizen volunteers, and were attacked in camp at daybreak on the 9th. Their force amounted to 350 warriors, of whom a large number were surprised and killed in their teepees or wigwams. Nevertheless, with remarkable bravery and discipline they continued the fight all day, assuming the offensive, but disappeared in the night. Forty of their dead were counted on a portion of the battle-field. The troops, too, suffered a heavy loss—namely, seven officers, fifty regulars, and ten volunteers, of whom the killed numbered twenty-five. General Gibbon was among the wounded. He was joined on the 11th by General Howard, upon whom the pursuit will now devolve.

It is notable that for four consecutive days during the last week the price of gold did not vary from 105½; that is to say, for four days the U. S. legal-tender note for one dollar had a gold value of \$0.9501. The purchases of gold by the Syndicate to complete their settlement with the Treasury for 4 per cent. bonds had much to do in steadying the price, which otherwise would probably have fallen with the rates for sterling exchange. These, at the close of the week, were nearly down to the point at which gold can be imported without

loss, provided the London money market remains as low as 2 per cent. The Bank of England, however, lost such an amount of gold to Paris during the week as to harden discounts and make it probable that the Bank will at an early day advance its discount rate to 2½ or 3 per cent. Notwithstanding this and the fact that in our foreign trade the imports are steadily increasing, it is probable that within 60 days we shall again be importing gold. The outlook for general trade during the autumn is encouraging. The wheat crop in the West is the largest ever raised, and other cereals are very promising. The cotton crop will also be a very large one, some estimates placing it above last year's. In Wall Street the inclination among speculators is to close their eyes to everything except the crops, and "bull" prices. Accordingly, there has been an advancing market for shares during the week.

Parliament was prorogued on Tuesday until October 30, to the great satisfaction of the British public, annoyed as they have been by the recent disorderly proceedings in the House of Commons. The Queen's speech was divided between the Eastern Question and the annexation of the Transvaal. Representations to Russia defining the "interests of the country" had "elicited a reply indicating friendly disposition on the part of that state," so that there had been no occasion to abandon the neutrality already professed by England. It was still possible, however, that the "rights of the Empire" (a bolder phrase than "interests," but equally vague) might be "assailed or endangered," in which case Her Majesty's Government would of course rely on the aid of Parliament in vindicating them.

The Russians in Bulgaria seem still to be under the paralyzing influence of the Plevna disaster. They are waiting for reinforcements, which have actually begun moving towards the Danube. Krüdener (or Latoff, who is said to have succeeded him) and Shakhovski, heavily reinforced from neighboring quarters, confront Osman Pasha at Plevna, but apparently shun a new collision. Their superior, the Grand Duke Nicholas, has removed his headquarters from Tirnova, backward, to Bulgareni, in the vicinity of their camps. On August 6, it is reported, 5,000 of Osman's cavalry attacked the Russians in a fortified position between Laskar, twelve miles south of Plevna, and the River Ruzhitzza—which is rather vague, as the Osma intervenes—and were repulsed, but the Russians abstained from pursuing. On the following day a force of Russian infantry and cavalry made an attack on Lovatz (or Lovtcha), but retired with severe loss. These troops probably belonged to the division of Dragomiroff, which is stationed between Tirnova and Lovatz, while, further south, that of Mirski is entrenched before Selvi, thus covering the north entrance to the Shipka pass, which seems still to be held by Gourko. The Trans-Balkan region, however, has been completely evacuated, and any renewal of operations there is generally considered to be for a time out of the question.

The army of the Tzezarevitch, which has probably been somewhat depleted in favor of that of the right, is displaying equally little vigor. About 60,000 strong, it holds the long line of the river Lom and its main upper branch, the Kara (Black) Lom, from the Danube, near Rustchuk, to the slopes of the Balkans. The headquarters of the Crown-Prince, with the bulk of the Thirteenth Corps, are at Katzelevo, near the east bank of the Kara Lom, confronting Mehemet Ali Pasha's position at Rasgrad; the Twelfth Corps, nearer Ruštchuk, is at Kadiköi, also east of the river a little below the junction of the Ak (White) Lom; the First Division of the Thirteenth Corps occupies the southernmost position, between Osman Bazar and Tirnova. A strong detachment of this division on Aug. 8 attacked the Turks at Yaila, twelve miles west of Osman Bazar, and suffered a repulse. Cavalry attacks south of Rasgrad, about the same time, proved equally unsuccessful, if anything more than a reconnaissance was intended. Suleiman Pasha was in the meanwhile endeavoring to cross the Balkans through the Feredjish or some other

pass, southeast of Tirnova. Whether Mehemet Ali, strengthened by Suleiman's forces and by the troops withdrawn from the Caucasus, will venture on an offensive movement against the army of the Russian Crown-Prince, or continue to pursue the Fabian tactics instituted by his predecessor, Abdul-Kerim, must soon become apparent. The Egyptian troops under Prince Hassan are reported to have begun a movement against Gen. Zimmermann's forces in the Dobruja—against his rear, if he has actually commenced the evacuation of that low and swampy region, in which his army has too long been exposed to the ravages of malarious diseases without being able to execute any serious military operations. Fevers are also prevalent at the imperial headquarters at Biela—if the Czar is still there—and that to a very alarming degree as reports have it.

But however frightful the ravages of manly warfare and of more destructive disease may be in the camps of the two contending powers, incomparably more horrid is the aspect of the carnage perpetrated on each other by the Bulgarian and Turkish populations of the districts successively occupied and abandoned by the Russians, or wantonly indulged in by irregular troops, probably on both sides. The recital of these horrors is sickening in the highest degree, and both parties delight in picturing them in detail, hoping to make capital by so doing. We are not going to abridge these narratives in our columns, both on account of their ghastliness and of the uncertainty which still attaches to most of the facts related. We are fortunately so situated here that no amount of barbarity proved against Turk or Bulgarian, Bashi-Bazuk or Cossack, can drive us into a crusade against the Crescent or an alliance against the Czar; and for a mere expression of decided sympathy we can wait until a critical sifting of the evidence and weighing of responsibilities has taken place through impartial observers. As an expression of opinion, suffice it to say that we consider both parties guilty of a certain amount of "atrocities," and the accounts on both sides to be grossly exaggerated and partly invented; that the history of the struggles between Russians and Turks, between Turks and revolted rayahs, between Russians and Turkomans, etc., has taught us not to disbelieve any statement of savagery in those quarters merely because it is apt to shake one's faith in the goodness of human nature; that we find it natural that the blood shed in Bulgarian districts in 1876, when insurrection was brewing, was productive of retaliatory bloodshed in 1877, when the Turks were fleeing before the Russians; and that we presume the Russians to be guilty of rashly fomenting insurrection south of the Balkans, and the Turks of cruelly suppressing or chastising insurrection when the retreat of the Russians left the Bulgarian inhabitants of Eski Saghra, Kalofer, Karlova, etc.—armed and unarmed—to their tender mercies. Nor is fierceness, stimulated by fanaticism, fear, and revenge, limited, even in our times, to the east of Europe, as witness the Sepoy war, the Carlist war, or the Commune of Paris.

In Asia both the Turkish and Russian armies appear to have assumed the offensive almost at the same time. The Turks about August 5 invaded Russian Armenia (the government of Erivan), crossing the Tchiadji pass, south of the high Alagöz group of mountains, and advancing as far as Alikutchak, twenty-five miles northwest of Erivan. Alikutchak was easily taken, but an attack on a neighboring place was repulsed after a severe fight, which seems to have baffled the further advance in the rear of Tergukassoff, who was concentrating at Igdyr, near the foot of Mt. Ararat. Shortly after this Russian general crossed the frontier and advanced to Balüklü, west-north-west of Bayazid, a portion or the whole of the Turkish invading force withdrew from Russian territory. In the meanwhile strong Russian detachments, all probably belonging to the forces in the centre, under Loris Melikoff, had attacked various points on or near the frontier river Arpa Tchai. The Turks claim advantages in several encounters, but nothing important is as yet reported from either side. An artillery duel is also stated to have taken place before Batum.

THE SPEECHES AT CLEVELAND.

THE speech of Judge West, accepting the Republican nomination for Governor of Ohio, which was briefly noticed in our last issue, has been visited with just indignation by a portion of the Republican press, and damned with exceedingly faint praise by another. The *New York Times* calls it "a communistic tirade that must have delighted any member of the International Federation of Labor who happened to hear it." It was preceded by a harangue from Senator Matthews of the most objectionable type, the worst parts of which were reproduced by Judge West, although the tone he adopted was somewhat freer from demagogism than was the Senator's. It is difficult to say how far Judge West was struggling with confusion of ideas, and how far he is chargeable with intent to make bad matters worse, in order to gain the votes of the rioters and their sympathizers. We prefer to believe that he looked upon the riotous element of society as helpless drunkards, who are to be reformed not by abstaining from liquor but by denouncing the rum-seller, or as children who have burned their hands and set the house on fire with explosives, and who are to be pacified by throwing all the blame on the naughty gunpowder. It is reasonable to suppose that he had no clear conception of his subject, since the very pith of his discourse is the strange notion that railroad companies should be restrained by law from carrying freight at such low rates that they cannot earn money enough to pay their employees "a just compensation." A few years ago the Legislature was invoked to compel railroads to lower their rates, the law of competition having enabled them to maintain high ones. Now it is gravely proposed to compel them by statute to raise their rates, the law of competition having forced them to adopt low ones. What Judge West proposes is, therefore, to abolish railway competition.

The step from this project to that of abolishing the competition of labor generally is not wide. Judge West proceeded to take it by announcing that he was in favor of fixing a minimum price for labor, and requiring that this minimum price be supplemented at the end of each year by a dividend out of the profits of the business. This rule is to be applicable to "all who labor in the mines and upon the railroads," but why it should be limited to miners and railway hands is not by any means clear. Operatives in mills, factories, stone-quarries, brick-yards, printing-offices, etc., will justly object to an aristocracy of labor in the departments of mining and railway transportation, and will claim the benefits of Judge West's improved method of dealing with the labor question; and when they, too, shall have been admitted to a share in them, the drayman, the longshoreman, the seamstress, the farm-hand, and all those who depend upon job-work and piece-work will be entitled to ask for the equivalent of the legal minimum for their labor, and of the statutory dividend out of somebody's profits. All this is of the essence of the doctrines proclaimed by the bedlamites of the several French revolutions, and their last expression—the last before the régime of street barricades and petroleum—is that the state must find employment and wages for everybody. We doubt whether Judge West contemplates so extreme a measure under a form of government whose chief boast is that it meddles as little as possible with the private concerns of the citizen. Nevertheless, he may fairly be held responsible for conclusions to which he logically points the way.

If argument were needed to refute Judge West and Senator Matthews, it would be sufficient to say that the world was not made in the way they would like to have it. Whether they could make a better one by leaving out the principle of competition may well be questioned, but it cannot be doubted that that principle is part of the organic law of the human race. When it shall have been so far reformed that the state is charged to see that everybody has employment and wages of some kind, it will reassert itself by demands for particular kinds of employment and particular rates of wages, until the whole framework of "reform" tumbles into ruin—that is, until society gets back to the starting-point at which the reformers began their experiment. This, however, need not, and probably would not, deter a new set from commencing at the same place and

going over the same ground. Very much may be pardoned to the spirit of sympathy which looks upon all human suffering and privation as somehow linked with bad laws or with the want of good ones. We should be glad to believe that Judge West's dangerous utterances had no other inspiration, but, considering the time and place and the character borne by the speaker as the representative of his party, they call for all the censure they have received or are likely to receive. Such speeches from such men are the common forerunners and provocations of riots, and are of the stuff that make standing armies necessary in order that the world may not lapse again into a state where the only form of competition prevailing is that of the fist.

Senator Matthews is committed by his speech to the twofold task of abolishing "reckless competition" among railways by law, and of providing statutory means of arbitration between employers and employees in respect of wages. These two projects naturally go together, for they imply that all railways, except those most favorably situated, shall earn nothing, and that all laborers out of employment shall be deprived of the means of getting any. With competition abolished, the weaker members of the community are no longer permitted to offer their services at lower rates of compensation than the legal standard. Hence they will have good cause to demand that the state, which has taken away their natural rights, shall support them in their enforced idleness; and, as regards non-paying railways, that it shall make good all deficiencies in their earnings arising from their compliance with the law. Statutory arbitration between employer and employee is a vague and unmeaning phrase unless it implies enough force to bring the parties under its jurisdiction, and the exercise of such force is simply deprivation of freedom of choice to both; for if the employer is bound to pay the rate of wages decided upon by authority, the employee must be bound to work for the wages so decreed, even though he can do better elsewhere. This is equivalent to ruling out the unemployed altogether. Probably Senator Matthews's sympathies are not so engrossed with the misfortunes of those who are receiving only half-wages that he can do nothing for those who are receiving none. The public treasury is the only resource left for them. All the large streams and all the small rills intended to fructify industry on the plan proposed have their beginning in the reservoir of general taxation. Taxing all for the support of all is a principle in which any *communard* of the Old World can serve as preceptor to Senator Matthews, and one which the people of Ohio should be warned not to import in any of the disguises in which candidates for office may seek to array it. Since the best time to decide any question is when it presents itself for decision, it is most fitting that the doctrines propounded in the speeches at Cleveland should be met now, or that active preparations should be made to meet them. Old party ligaments may prevent any sharp division in the present campaign. Politicians will stave off the encounter as long as possible, but events will, in all probability, crowd it forward in spite of covering parties and ambiguous platforms; and the sooner the better. Let those who would abolish competition, and throw all persons upon the public treasury for support who are not receiving "a just compensation," range themselves on one side, and let all who esteem this idea a subversion of civilized society, and especially of the American type of civilization, take their places in the opposite ranks as fast as possible.

FILIBUSTERING IN PARLIAMENT.

THE contention in the British House of Commons between six or seven Irish "Home-Rulers" and the rest of the House has brought out in a somewhat striking way the very French character of what is called "the national movement" in Ireland, and will probably render still more difficult the creation of anything like a good understanding between English and Irish politicians. In the first place, the Home-Rulers will probably never be forgiven the introduction of the practice of "filibustering" into the House of Commons. Filibustering has derived some dignity in this country from the fact that during the slavery controversy it was made

use of as a quasi-revolutionary proceeding for ends so important that any means seemed justifiable. But frequent resort to it is none the less calculated to bring parliamentary institutions into contempt. Rules of procedure are intended, of course, to aid a legislative body in arriving at decisions. Using them to prevent decisions and to stop the transaction of legitimate business and to prevent the majority having its lawful way, by substituting a trial of physical endurance for one of persuading power, is a gross and scandalous perversion. Rules will, of course, be now and then used, and often pardonably used, for the temporary postponement of a vote; but this is a different thing from formally challenging a majority to see which side of the House would divide oftener without bodily prostration.

In this latter and extreme form filibustering has been hitherto unknown in England, and it has been introduced now for the somewhat ridiculous purpose of forcing the great majority of the members to accept the views of a minority of seven as to the hours at which the House of Commons should sit. The House, on every day in the week except Wednesday, begins its session late in the afternoon, and usually sits late into the night, under the single restriction that no "opposed business" can be brought up after midnight. There are many plain objections to this system, the principal one being that a large body of the members absent themselves at the dinner hour, between eight and ten, and are not in deliberative mood afterwards. But it has the great and overmastering excellence of enabling busy lawyers and merchants and government officers, who are hard at work in the courts or in their offices all day, to serve as legislators without interfering with their ordinary avocations, or, at all events, interfering to an intolerable degree; and the advantage of having such men in a legislative body cannot be overrated. To this Messrs. Parnell and O'Donnell and Biggar, who would like to go to bed at midnight, and profess not to care how the House of Commons is made up, object, and, not being able to win the majority over to their way of thinking, determined to force them into concurrence by the infliction of what was in reality corporal chastisement. Behind this there was probably another more powerful motive—that of pleasing their constituents by showing how much they could vex and incommode the Englishmen without violating the law. The Irish voter is of a most litigious temper, and there is nothing which gives him more pleasure than a successful game of legal chicane. Daniel O'Connell probably owed more of the continuance of his popularity to the general faith in his smartness as a lawyer, or, to use his own phrase, to the belief that "he could drive a coach-and-six through an act of Parliament," than to any other one thing; and the discovery that he had been caught in "sedition" by the Crown lawyers was a disenchantment from which his reputation never recovered. There is, too, probably below this merely combative satisfaction with the tactics of their representatives a vague hope that by making their presence in the House very obnoxious and inconvenient, England may be induced finally to consent to that division of legislative powers known under the name of "Home Rule."

There is, however, a certain amount of justice in one point of the Home-Rulers' case. One of the reasons why they are unwilling to permit legislation after midnight is, they say, that the English members refuse to give proper attention to Irish business; and that this is true there is little question. There is a great deal of legislation done for Ireland in Parliament, and a great deal of discussion of Irish questions, but the proportion of English members who pay any attention to them or take interest in them is very small; and the Government is, as a general rule, sure of being supported blindly in any course it may please to adopt with regard to them, as long as it shows no sign of concession to the priests. The same thing is true with regard to Scotland. Very few English members have any knowledge of Scotch affairs, or take the trouble of forming any opinion about them; but Scotch affairs are left by the Government almost completely to Scotch members, who form a little council under the presidency of the Lord Advocate, and anything they settle on on purely Scotch matters the Ministry, as a rule, are willing

to adopt. Now, Ireland differs from England still more than Scotland does, and its peculiarities of local feeling, and usage, and manners, which ought to be taken into account in all legislation which is local in its intention, are still less comprehensible to Englishmen than those of Scotland. Nevertheless, not only are Irish members not allowed to frame the Irish policy of the Government, but their opinions about it, except as those of members having votes, are not greatly regarded. This is, there is no question, an unfortunate state of things, of which it is quite natural for the Home-Rulers to complain; but, like so many other Irish troubles, its roots go far back into the past. As a matter of fact, Ireland was originally annexed to England by conquest, and the practice of governing it without reference to the feelings of the natives not unnaturally then grew up. But it was afterwards settled solidly, and the local government seized and firmly held by Englishmen and Scotchmen, or, in other words, from a conquered country it became a colony composed for all political purposes of men of the English faith and blood, and forthwith had applied to it the régime under which the American colonies revolted. Ireland attempted the same mode of deliverance, but was too near home to be successful, and it had the curious but unfortunate experience of obtaining relief finally simply through the slow and irritating growth of wisdom and justice in the English mind with regard to the government of dependencies. But the habit of looking at Irish questions from an English point of view, and of feeling that Irishmen did not understand them perfectly, had become too deeply rooted in English politics to be readily got rid of; and when the Catholics were emancipated, the division among Irish politicians—the old and bitter feud, in short, between the English colonists and the natives—came into play to furnish a ready excuse for English ignorance as to what Irishmen want, and for the refusal of the Government to leave Irish affairs in Irish hands.

At present the Home-Rulers represent not only the least intelligent and poorest portion of the Irish community, but, what is still more unfortunate, a portion of it which is no more willing or prepared to play the game of politics in Anglo-Saxon fashion than Paul de Cassagnac. The curse of all "national" movements in Ireland is that they are not national. Whatever nomenclature or war-cries may be used in them, everybody knows that their strongest influence comes from Rome, and that the social and political ideal at which they aim would contain neither a really free parliament nor a really free press, and that political questions would in it be settled not by open discussion, or a fair vote, but by communications from the other world, transmitted through the bishops. As long, in short, as the bulk of the Irish people is as much dominated by priestly influence as it is now, a real government of the English type can hardly be maintained amongst them except by and through the good-natured and well-meaning but rather arrogant domination to which Irish representatives find themselves exposed in the House of Commons—which is another way of saying that "clericalism" is as much a curse in Ireland as it is in France and Spain, and that the spectacle of a Protestant like Mr. Parnell trying to play the patriot under its influence, and in responsibility to it, is grotesque as well as melancholy.

RAILROAD WAGES.

IN consequence of their embarrassed financial condition many of the railroad companies have reduced by ten per cent. the wages of their employees, and this reduction, it is alleged in some quarters, is a tyrannical and inhuman act, which has no complete justification in either economics or morals. In examining, as we now purpose doing, the correctness of this allegation, we shall have nothing to say about the recklessness of railroad management, swindling directors, and autocratic presidents. About these things we have already expressed decided opinions, and shall, without doubt, have occasion to refer to them again; but the wages of employees are not dependent upon the blunders or misconduct of their employers, and we have been sorry to observe respectable newspapers recently half-apologizing to the strikers whom they opposed, because of the assumed immoralities of railroad managers.

We do not care to consider any argument in justification of the late reduction which would not be equally good were railroad companies universally made up either of knaves or angels.

Hitherto railroad employees have been content with their wages. No one pretends that they have been unfairly proportioned to the wages of other American workmen, and we have all listened to the triumphant terms in which these have been compared with the wages of workmen in other countries. It is fair to assume, therefore, that until a very late date engineers, firemen, and brakemen were unable to complain of the equitableness of their wages. But precise figures and a good starting-point are furnished us by Mr. Arthur, chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in a recent communication to the *Herald*. Twenty years ago, says Mr. Arthur, engineers' wages were \$60 and firemen's \$30 per month, conductors' from \$40 to \$60, and brakemen's \$30. He admits also that the present pay of all these classes is now, since the reduction, equal to what it was then, but asserts that the cost of living is twice as much now as then. There was no great fault found with the wages of railroad hands prior to the civil war. Mr. Arthur's first statement may be accepted as substantially correct. There was probably more variation in the wages of railroad hands then than now. Firemen and brakemen certainly received less than \$30 per month on some roads twenty years ago, and some engineers received more than \$60, but the average must have been very nearly as above stated.

It is not necessary for us to repeat here any of the long lists of figures with which the papers have been filled giving the wages of the different classes of employees on different roads, and comparing them with the wages received in other years. It is sufficient for our purpose to state that, taking the average of wages actually paid by a large number of roads, railroad engineers are now receiving \$85 per month, firemen \$45, and brakemen more than \$42—in many instances more than firemen. Of course the variations from these averages are considerable, but, so far as we have been able to ascertain, no engineer receives less than \$60, and no fireman or brakeman less than \$30—that is, as regular pay for full time—while some engineers receive as high as \$115, and some firemen over \$58. Not only, therefore, do these three classes of employees receive as much as in 1860, but engineers average 41½ per cent. more, brakemen 39½ per cent. more, and firemen 50 per cent. more.

It should be remembered, moreover, that the wages of railroad hands have never been very much higher than at present. When the cost of living was greatly in excess of to-day's cost, the wages of firemen and brakemen, although larger than now, were not proportionately larger. There has been no reduction, save the present one of ten per cent., on the Pennsylvania road, for instance, since 1873; and Donahue, a leader of the strikers on the Erie road, employed there for more than twenty-five years, refers, in a published letter of grievances, to only one 10 per cent. reduction since the war. Putting together all the roads concerning which we have been able to obtain statistics, wages of the classes mentioned are nowhere much more than 20 per cent. below the highest point reached; 25 per cent. would be an extremely liberal allowance, but even this would be considerably below the average reduction in other and corresponding pursuits. To get some idea of the movements of wages, take those of carpenters from 1860 to the present time. One of the most prominent carpenters and builders of this city was paying in the spring and summer of 1860, to first-class workmen, \$2 per day of 10 hours' work. In the autumn his men struck for \$2 25 per day, and got it. In 1861, at the outbreak of the war, wages went all to pieces, and for a time no regular rates were established anywhere. They soon reached the last figures mentioned, however, and then rose rapidly until on the 1st of May, 1872, the same man agreed to pay the same class of workmen \$4 per day of only eight hours' work. This agreement lasted for two years. Then wages began to decline, and to-day the men in the same shop are receiving \$2 50 per day of ten hours' work, although in other shops the same class of workmen are paid but \$2 25. Carpenters' wages, therefore, have fallen from the highest point reached from 37½ to 43½ per cent. in actual wages paid, or, if the difference in the length of a day's work be taken into account, no less than 55 per cent. The wages of plasterers and masons have fallen still more. The highest point reached by them was \$5 50 and \$6 per day; the present price being \$2, or, in some cases, \$2 50—a fall of from 54½ to 66½ per cent. The most rapid rise in wages perhaps was that of first-class tailors, which, from 1863 to 1873, went up nearly 132 per cent., from which they have as yet declined not much more than 20 per cent., the hold of a powerful trade-union by which they were forced up and kept up having only recently been broken. The wages of common laborers have declined from 37½ to 50 per cent., and of other laborers in special pursuits but not

necessarily skilled workmen (blacksmiths' helpers, etc.), from 37½ to 60 per cent. These facts are enough to illustrate the truth that the wages of firemen and brakemen upon railroads have not fallen relatively as much as the wages of the great body of workingmen of all classes throughout the country, and this statement we believe to be indisputable ever after all allowances have been made for special cases of hardships and underpayment. Whatever real cause of complaint, therefore, railroad hands may now have with regard to the amount of their wages, the great body of mechanics and laborers, who have had no serious thoughts of striking, should have far greater cause.

The comparative necessary cost of living in different years can only be ascertained approximately because of the great number of articles and the fluctuations in prices to be considered. Rents of city mechanics have not as yet fallen from the highest point reached in proportion to wages. From ten to twenty per cent. would probably cover the average reduction in this class of tenements; but, on the other hand, the rents of railroad employees were probably never as high in proportion to wages as those of city mechanics. The cost of clothing, again, cannot be accurately compared, because the domestic stuffs of which common clothing was made in 1860 are not now manufactured. The fall in the price of the cheaper grades of goods, however, within the past three years has been very great, fully equalling the fall in wages, and bringing the price of a suit of clothes very close to that paid in 1860. Of other necessary articles of household expenditure, coal and oil are very much cheaper than in 1872-3, or even 1860, flour is cheaper than in 1873, vegetables are perhaps about the same as in 1860, and meat and butter are somewhat dearer. On the whole, we believe that the figures given recently in an article in the *Tribune* may be accepted as trustworthy. The average of prices of over sixty different articles of household expenditure is found to be less than seven per cent. above that of 1860. In other words, an engineer receiving \$60 per month in 1860 should receive to-day, if wages were governed solely by cost of living, about \$64 per month. As a matter of fact, he receives, as we have already ascertained, no less than \$85 per month.

We do not pretend to determine the amount per day upon which a workingman can live. It is well to remember, however, that not only all common laborers, but great numbers of workingmen at least as skilled in their pursuits as firemen and brakemen, are now living uncomplainingly upon far less than the wages paid to these. The striking miners in Pennsylvania have been receiving from \$15 to \$20 per month only, and assert that if their demand for 25 per cent. advance be complied with they are willing, if necessary, to work only a portion of the time, with, of course, a corresponding reduction in the amount of wages. Firemen and brakemen are not skilled mechanics. They are but a grade above common laborers. Their places, indeed, might readily be filled from among these. Their wages, therefore, can never be very high. That they can readily live upon the wages now received has already been proved by past experience. Their recent intense expression of dissatisfaction arose not from any clear understanding of the relative amount of wages received, but from the great difficulty which all unthinking persons have in consenting to the sacrifice of anything to which they have been for a time accustomed. No one, however intelligent, finds this process a pleasant one; but the ignorant man turns brute-like upon the hand that seems to be wilfully depriving him of his coveted goods. That the railroad companies are doing all that they might, even from interested motives, for the welfare of their employees our readers well know we do not believe; but they are paying the fireman or brakeman all that he is economically worth. Less than this he can never receive for any great length of time. A demand for more than this, accompanied with violence, can, in defence of the existence of society, only be met with violence.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE'S MISMANAGEMENT.

LONDON, August 1, 1877.

SO long ago as the beginning of September of last year I ventured to hazard an opinion in one of my letters to the *Nation* that Sir Stafford Northcote, the present leader of the House of Commons, was not strong enough for the place. "He is a dull man," I said, "without brilliancy or humor, and free from even the suspicion of genius. He will find it no easy task to keep his own party in hand, and an unruly House will laugh him to scorn." And on the 3d of February of this year I stated that, "Long before the middle of August, unless Sir Stafford Northcote develops faculties the germs of which have hitherto been screened from sight, the

discipline of the ministerial benches will be slackened, and the control of the House will be a thing of the future and the past. It is impossible that he can keep 658 middle-aged senators docile and amused throughout the dog-days." We are now at the beginning of August, in the middle of the dog-days, and the House of Commons is in a state of anarchy. I have just returned from witnessing the closing struggles of a now notorious band of seven Irish obstructionists, who have kept the House sitting for twenty-two hours on end, from 4 p.m. on Tuesday until 2 p.m. to-day, over the clauses of a simple bill; and the almost universal opinion of both sides of the House is, that no small portion of the blame to be attached to this scandalous exhibition is due to the weakness and the want of authority which are the predominant characteristics of Sir Stafford Northcote's public life. I do not for a moment wish to palliate the action of the Irish obstructives. Actuated as they have been, partly by an Irish desire to play a practical joke on a large scale upon the House of Commons, partly by vanity, partly by a confused idea that by bringing business to a standstill in a House of Parliament composed of English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish members, they will induce that House to sanction the existence of a House of Parliament composed exclusively of Irishmen, these seven Irishmen—Mr. Parnell, Mr. Biggar, Captain Nolan, Mr. Gray, Mr. O'Connor Power, Major O'Gorman, and Mr. Callan—have exhausted the forbearance of the House and tried the nerve of its present leader; and while the House has stood the strain upon it with credit and decorum, the leader of the House has failed conspicuously. Since the beginning of the session up to last night Sir Stafford Northcote has gone from bad to worse. He has done nothing well. He has not made a single speech of promise. He has said nothing worth remembering. He has not met the speeches of his opponents in fair argument. His policy appears to have been throughout the whole session to say nothing in as many words as possible, and trust to his mechanical majority to tide him over the troubles of the session. And this tiding over is comfortable enough in tranquil times when the routine business goes on without let or hindrance. It might answer at the commencement of a Parliament when troublesome men have not learned their power, and when the new administration has the freshness and polish of youth upon it. The times of late have not been tranquil, and though a man of the nerve and character of Mr. Disraeli, or of the innate dignity and authority of Lord Hartington, might, and probably would, have risen to the emergency, Sir Stafford Northcote has succumbed. Within the last two weeks he has made three egregious blunders, and by loosening discipline and confessing to his own weakness he has helped as much as any one to bring about the present demoralization of the House of Commons, which is in danger of becoming a by-word and reproach at home and a scandal and object of contempt to our friends abroad.

The Tory administrations of the past have not unfrequently been suspected of a tendency to jobbery, and those of late years have never been quite able to discard the taint and present a clean bill of health. The present administration has not been more fortunate than its predecessors. Ever since it came into office it has been *suspect*, and the Prime Minister has had the reputation of being a minister who might not hesitate to prefer the services of a personal or political friend to the national good, if he could do so with impunity. This being so, his recent appointments to lucrative posts in the civil service have been watched and scrutinized by some of the economists and purists in the matter of patronage who sit on the Opposition benches. A good fat post fell vacant some months ago—the Controllorship of the Stationery Office. This post had for some time been held by men distinguished rather for their literary accomplishments than for their knowledge of business. It had been filled by Mr. MacCulloch the political economist; and the last occupant was Mr. Rathbone Greg, under whom it had come to be regarded as a comfortable deanery in the civil service rather than as a post with duties attached to it which required the best of a man's time and attention. Four years ago a Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to enquire into the state of the different civil-service offices and to report what changes, if any, should be carried out in them. Among their various recommendations there was one regarding this office which was to the effect that when it became vacant it should be given to some one who was conversant with the technical knowledge required in a printer's or a stationer's business. Lord Beaconsfield, when Mr. Rathbone Greg resigned the other day, paid no attention to this recommendation, and appointed a junior clerk in the War Office, Mr. Pigott by name, who knew nothing of the technical matters of a printer's or stationer's business, and whose only recommendation, so far as the world knew, was the fact that he was the son of a former vicar of Lord Beaconsfield's parish in Buckinghamshire. This appoint-

ment, after due intimation, was brought up before the House of Commons and severely criticised. Sir Stafford Northcote was in his place to defend the appointment; but he had not a word to say for it. He let the condemnation go by default, and, for all he had to say, Lord Beaconsfield might as well not have been represented. A division, which practically was a vote of censure on Lord Beaconsfield, was taken, and the Government were left in a minority—some of their staunchest supporters deserting them and a few others actually voting against them.

Lord Beaconsfield was not a man to put up with this indignity. He could not, as a peer, defend himself in the House of Commons, and he had to make a personal explanation in the House of Lords. The fabric in which this historical assemblage meets is for acoustic purposes about the worst in England. The beauty of the proportions of the house is all that could be desired, and so far as the sense of sight is concerned there is no finer building extant. But the sound of the voice seems to fritter itself away among the Gothic arches and elaborated wood-work of the galleries and the gorgeous red morocco benches. When the house is crowded, it is generally difficult to hear the clearest speaker. On the occasion of Lord Beaconsfield's personal explanation the house was crammed. Every peer in London and within reach of London had come up, and the galleries set apart for peeresses—for they are merciful to the ladies of the patrician house, and allow them to see and hear the debates and to be seen, whereas in the Commons house they are caged up behind a grating—were filled by a coterie of the fairest and most influential ladies in the land. The portion of the house set apart for strangers and for members of the House of Commons was crowded to such an extent as hardly to leave standing room. Lord Beaconsfield had drawn a good house, and if on ordinary occasions it is difficult to catch a speaker's words, on such an occasion as this, when the voice has nothing more resonant to strike against than human bodies, it would be regarded as impossible. Lord Beaconsfield, however, spoke for upwards of an hour, and every intonation of his voice was audible in every part of the house. A more successful rhetorical performance has rarely been accomplished. But not only did he make himself heard, he made out a good case for the appointment, and, on the assumption that his statements were trustworthy, he cleared himself of every imputation of jobbery in this particular instance. But were his statements trustworthy?—that is the question which every one kept asking when the performance was completed. If they were, why were they not disclosed to Sir Stafford Northcote? Either they were not trustworthy, or Sir Stafford Northcote was unfit for his place and had neglected to inform himself in a case that seriously affected the public character of his chief. There was no escape from the dilemma. The whole subject was reviewed in the House of Commons on a motion calling on the House to rescind its former resolution. Then it was found that Lord Beaconsfield had in one or two particulars deviated from strict accuracy, but his statements as a whole were not disproved. Sir Stafford Northcote then got up and humbly explained that he had not got up his case. He called out that he and he alone had sinned, and begged that the censure of the House might fall on him, and not on the Prime Minister. When the leader of the House of Commons comes down and cries "*peccavi*" in such humble tones a generous body like the House forgives, and it accordingly rescinded its own resolution without a dissentient voice. But the discipline of the House was broken by this act of humiliation on the part of the leader, and the first active step toward anarchical demoralization had been taken.

We have gone on with giant strides since then. Last Wednesday Sir Stafford Northcote made his second blunder. The seven Irishmen of whom I have spoken were obstructing as usual. Sir Stafford Northcote, impelled apparently by the more hot-headed of his supporters round him, decided that it was full time that something should be done. He accordingly moved that certain words which fell from Mr. Parnell should be taken down, and on these words he proposed a resolution that Mr. Parnell should be suspended from the discharge of his duties for two days, when the whole subject should be brought up. But what were the words on which this indictment was to be framed? Mr. Parnell had stated "that he should have satisfaction in preventing and thwarting the intentions of the Government." On a moment's reflection, the House saw that there was nothing obstructive or wrong in a parliamentary sense in these words. The *raison d'être* of an opposition and all the elaborate machinery of party organization is to prevent and thwart the intentions of the government of the day, and party government could not go on upon any other terms. If Mr. Parnell had expressed satisfaction in thwarting the business of the House or the business of the country, Sir Stafford Northcote would have been in the right. But Mr. Parnell is too

sharp for that sort of thing. Sir Stafford Northcote struck too soon and took the fly out of the salmon's mouth. The House saw this at once, and one of Sir Stafford's colleagues had to move the adjournment of the debate, and Mr. Parnell triumphed. This was blunder number two.

Two days after, another disorderly scene took place in the House upon the ruling of the Chairman of Committees. The Chairman ruled that an honorable member was in order in alluding to certain customs and laws, but that he would be out of order if he entered into an elaborate discussion upon these customs and laws. The ruling is obviously a doubtful one, but Mr. Callan, one of the obstructives, somewhat exceeded the limits of Parliamentary decorum by insisting that this ruling was "an insult to the common sense of the House." He was repeatedly called to order and desired to withdraw these words, and when he declined to do so Sir Stafford Northcote rushed into the fray and moved, as he did in Mr. Parnell's case, that Mr. Callan's words should be taken down. This time he was too late. The Chairman informed the House that as some discussion had taken place between the time that the words were uttered and the motion made by Sir Stafford Northcote, the time had passed when the words could be taken down. It was clearly a sacrifice of dignity for the leader of the House to interpose at all in the middle of a heated and acrimonious wrangle unless he could do so successfully. But to interpose at the wrong time and in the wrong way was an act of folly. This was blunder number three.

The scandal created by these nightly exhibitions of rowdiness is fast becoming intolerable. All self-respecting Englishmen are now only longing for the prorogation, in order that the indecency of these wrangles in the legislature may cease. We feel that a new Parliament and a new leader are imperatively demanded, and we hope that these disreputable occurrences may tend to satisfy these demands. There are some also who piously join in the supplication which Mr. Spurgeon offered up some months ago: "And, O God! give our senators wisdom, especially at this critical time. Let not the extraordinary folly of our rulers lead our country into trouble, and change our rulers, O God! as soon as possible."

A GERMAN EULOGIST OF GAMBETTA.*

II.

FREIBURG, July 18.

NOW, however, the reverse of the medal is presented. Herr von der Goltz emphasizes the fact that, contrary to a pretty common belief, the equipment of the republican troops was good, and their arms, for the most part, excellent—the chassepots being decidedly superior to the *Zündnadelgewehr*. But good arms alone are not sufficient to make enormous masses of able-bodied men great armies. According to the author, the efficiency of the armies was seriously impaired by their very hugeness. He reproaches Gambetta with overstretching all his schemes to gigantic dimensions. The metal of the German troops had been sufficiently tested to know that they could not be made to shake in their boots because vast numbers were drawn up before them. On the other hand, theatrical effects make a great impression on the average French mind. The grand spectacle drew away many a man to the ranks who was willing to share in the certain triumphs, but not at all anxious really to undergo the dangers and tremendous hardships of a *guerre à outrance*. Draconian laws were necessary to render these men conscious that the dictator was in terrible earnest, and fully aware that he had undertaken no child's play. But no articles of war could make up for the lack of thorough training. Inefficiently trained troops, no matter how brave they are and how glowing their patriotism, inevitably step more on each other's toes the greater their number is. When a certain number has been reached every further addition actually works to the disadvantage of the army.

It is probable that Gambetta had not entirely overlooked that; but there was a fatal discrepancy between his means and his more immediate end. The author is satisfied that the fundamental idea of the dictator was the only correct one. If anything could be effected at all, it was only by organizing the *Volkskrieg*, by opposing the French people to the German soldiers. As it was, the recuperative power of Germany, principally with regard to officers, was very nearly exhausted. "At Le Mans, regiments were engaged who had only nine, twelve, and fifteen real officers (*Berufsoffiziere*) left. On December 11, 1870, after the battle at Beaugency, the second Bavarian division had only one captain of the line, who stood in the front as commander of a *Compagnie*. In this division five or six battalions were commanded by first lieutenants, many *Compagnies* by young officers from the reserve. With the Prussian troops

it was pretty much the same. All those who had done much fighting were gradually changed into a mass of reserve-recruits, with officers who had received their training through one year of volunteer service. The army was on the way to be changed by and by into a militia" (pp. 290, 291). A harassing defensive war, extended over as great an area as possible, the author seems to think, would have been the right thing for the French to do. Even after they had lost half their officers, and "when part of their infantry had to work their way forward over snow-fields and through winter storms barefoot and in torn clothes, when food was lacking and the ammunition had to be spared," the Germans knew how to conquer. But in that way they could, perhaps, have been tired out and forced to use themselves up by their very successes. Gambetta was fully aware of that. He afterwards declared before his judges that the Germans "perceived very well that they had reached the limit where their military institutions stood on the very point of exhausting themselves." And yet all his energies were bent upon collecting in a few weeks huge masses in order to be able to strike, without delay, a few decisive blows. His fundamental idea was *defense*; and yet, from the very first moment, he threw himself with headlong recklessness into an eminently *aggressive* warfare, which offered no chance of success. His starting point was the conviction that Paris was not France—that France could be saved though Paris was lost; and yet he risked and lost all in endeavoring to save France, though he never relinquished his first idea, and still maintains its correctness. When the President of the Court of Enquiry asked him whether, after the capitulation of Paris, he had still thought resistance possible, he answered with fire: "Certainly, Mr. President, and I still think so. . . . There is no nation in Europe which has not at a given moment had the foreigner on its soil, which has not kept him there a long time, but finally driven him out after all. And by what force has that been done? By that of genius, by military combinations? Never! But by courage, by stubbornness, by pertinacity. So it has been with the Austrians, the Russians, the Spaniards, the English; but we, we wanted to liberate ourselves in forty days, up to a fixed date, suddenly, as if a mercantile transaction was in question."

His acts give ample proof that this was his real opinion at the time. He was, indeed, not discouraged for one single moment. The author is full of sincere and high admiration for the energy and elasticity of this mind, its unspeakable belief in the strength and in the virtue of France, and its bewildering fruitfulness in grand schemes. Every new disaster seems to increase his own strength and his resources. The first Army of the Loire being whipped to the verge of annihilation, in the twinkling of an eye there are two armies of the Loire in the field, and a more grandly conceived plan is to be pursued. This having entirely miscarried, the seat of his aggressive warfare is suddenly transferred to the frontiers of Alsace. Bourbaki's army, turned almost into an armed rabble, wends its dreary way to Switzerland; and still another plan is brought forth—this time, it is true, stark mad, but yet a plan; while, at the same time, Chanzy gets more than a plan—men and material enough to enable him to recommence his operations at the very moment that the gates of Paris are opened. In all these plans—with the single exception of the one after Bourbaki's defeat—the author discovers a small spark of real genius glowing. He has already declared that Gambetta undid by his strategy what he had done by his organization, for that required time, while this demanded overhaste. Yet he thinks that the reputation of a very good general would suffer no harm from the groundwork of the dictator's strategical conceptions.

Nevertheless it is here that Herr von der Goltz finds the second cardinal mistake in Gambetta's military career. He was not content with organizing resistance, he also wanted to direct the campaign; he was not only minister of war but also commander-in-chief, and as such he betrayed the lawyer at every step, and the more so the longer the bloody game lasted. A genius of the first order instinctively remains within those limits to which nature has confined his greatness. Gambetta was the victim of a gross illusion about the extent of the uncommon powers of his intellect, and France had to pay dearly for it. The man of yesterday, the offspring of the revolution, whose only title to authority and leadership are his talents and his tremendous will, apes the Vienna *Hofkriegsrath* of by-gone times. The man who is vying with Carnot as an organizer, is turned into a doctrinarian of the most dangerous sort. What boots it that the flash of genius is still perceptible in his general conceptions? His unbridled imagination carries him as in a whirlwind over the rocks on which his generals, who have to tread the hard soil of reality, are to dash their military reputations to atoms, and over the abysses which cannot be filled by the corpses of his men, though they are hurled in by thousands and ten-thousands. Moltke would have considered the man a fool who had

* See No. 632 of the NATION.

urged him to prescribe to his generals every step they were to take; Gambetta, who before had barely seen a review on the Champ de Mars, deemed himself fully competent to do so. And yet he did not dare to carry out the fatal principle to its last consequences. He hesitated, faltered, did the one thing as well as the other, and thereby made bad worse. The author has laid great stress on the fact that Gambetta had the nerve to take on his own shoulders the whole responsibility for all the money and all the blood this second war was to cost France. But here Herr von der Goltz points out that there was a deficiency not only in his intellectual powers, but also in his moral qualities, which absolutely forbids us to call him a great man. While he dictated the minutest detail "from the green table," he had not the moral courage to break down every resistance; he neither acknowledged the authority of the professional men, nor did he dare to place before them the alternative—Unconditional submission to my will or quit your place. He neither confined himself to what he was really able to do, nor did he show the metal required for what he presumed to do; he persisted in actually being the commander-in-chief, and the responsibility which he had assumed as such he shoved off on the shoulders of his generals, whose advice he did not heed; and he did it in a manner which the author is forced to call "little loyal," "very ambiguous," "an intrigue," "a plot." General d'Aurelle wanted to remain on the defensive at Orleans. The dictator neither renounced his own aggressive plan, nor did he compel him to obey; behind his back he ordered General Pallières to march on Pithiviers. "General d'Aurelle was degraded to the part of a communicator of telegrams to his commanding generals." And so with Bourbaki; Gambetta had no confidence in him, and yet he was afraid to face public opinion for venturing to dispense with the services of such a renowned general. The general, who was personally a very brave man but without backbone, neither insisted on his own opinions nor submitted implicitly; the dictator chafed under his slowness and indecision—and kept him; the execution of gigantic problems was entrusted to a man who did not believe in the possibility of success. If anything could justify the ex-lawyer for presuming to play the part of a great commander, it was the reckless energy which the absolute rule of one will could infuse into everything, and just this, which the dictator had known so well how to improve as an organizer, he completely sacrificed as actual commander-in-chief.

But more than that. His moral weakness or his vanity was great enough to make him assert, at the time and afterwards, that nothing was done which had not first received the assent of the generals. History will know, as well as he himself and as his generals knew, how to distinguish between the substance and an empty formality. He went further. After the defeat at and the loss of Orleans, D'Aurelle had to serve as scapegoat. Not only was he blamed for not having remained at Orleans, when his staying there would have irretrievably sealed the fate of the remnants of his army, but he was publicly and in the most cutting manner reproached for not having concentrated his army in time, while it was the dictator and his delegate Freycinet who, against his repeated and most earnest remonstrances, had scattered it to the four winds, while he had been rebuked by the wise remark that Prince Friedrich Karl had "a still more extended front." One of the main weights which crushed the energy, as well of D'Aurelle as of Bourbaki, was the fear that, in case of a failure, the dictator would hurl his terrible accusations against them, and that they, like Bazaine, would be charged with treason. Would there have been no just cause for this fear even if they had not had the example of Bazaine before their eyes? Gambetta's patriotism raved under the truth, and he did not think France able to stand it. There, the author justly says, is the main root of his failure. The comparatively small success at Coulmiers, the drawn battle at Villersexel, the one German standard gathered up from among the thickly-strewn corpses at Dijon, were trumpeted as great victories, which left no doubt that now the hour was at hand when the "barbarians" would be ignominiously hunted from the holy soil of France; and, in consequence, the defeat at Beaune la Rolande, Bourbaki's retreat, Garibaldi's inactivity, had a crushing effect upon public opinion. In this most essential respect Gambetta was not a whit better than the "light-hearted" men of the Empire; with illusions and direct lies the *grande nation* had to be fed. But if "genius" and "military combinations" cannot drive out the invader, illusions and lies are certainly much less proper means. There is the cardinal difference between 1813 and 1870-71. Germany rose to reconquer her very existence, while France did not want to pay a single inch of her soil as indemnity for the sins of her Government and her people. The Germans, therefore, went into the war with every muscle and every nerve strained by the full consciousness that they were going to engage in a death-grapple for every-

thing worth living for: the French, on the contrary, succumbed because their patriotism, though it added a laurel-leaf of melancholy greatness to the national fame, did not and could not come up to either the horrors or the sacrifices of a real *guerre à outrance*, for it was adulterated by too large a share of mere national vanity and hollow vaingloriousness.

Did Gambetta himself feel that, when he laid down his dictatorship after having thrown the gauntlet to the Government of National Defence? Honor to him if this was his motive for at last loosening the iron grasp with which he had held his country for four months! But even then it would be true—"he had either done too much or not enough." This, however, is not the last word of Herr von der Goltz. He most emphatically denies that the only results of Gambetta's dictatorship have been incalculable quantities of money and blood wasted, and harder conditions for his country. "Already to-day we can say that [history] will accord him, too, *immortal* merits. The first is that, immediately after the deepest fall, he gave back to France the consciousness of strength. The second is that, by lashing up his people for an ideal aim, he broke the way for a moral resurrection which at this hour has unmistakably commenced in France."

If my hope is to be fulfilled, that these lines may serve to induce some publisher to present this book in an English dress to the American public—an undertaking the success of which I should be willing to guarantee—I shall be justified in herewith bringing my remarks to a close, though the remaining sixty-three pages of the work are probably the most important part of it—at least for us. They are devoted to the discussion of the practical lessons which the author draws from the history he has told the reader. Here in Germany they have set people to thinking, military men as well as others; and every intelligent American reader will also find in them much material for instructive reflection.* They may be briefly summed up in the following three sentences: In Europe no militia can compete with a regularly trained army. The present military institutions of Germany do not give sufficient security to the Empire for the future; they can be and they must be rendered more efficient without increasing the burden already resting so heavily on the nation. Perfecting the tactics, improving the arms, etc., are alone not sufficient, and in some essential respects even contain an element of great danger, which is already exerting an evil influence on our army; if we do not know, first, how to make the *allgemeine Wehrpflicht* a truth, and, second, how to raise the moral standard of the people and of the army to a higher eminence, we shall be found too light the next time we are thrown into the scales and weighed.

Correspondence.

MISSOURI IN THE REBELLION AND DURING THE STRIKE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In noticing the work of Mahan on the late war, in your issue of the 2d inst., you express surprise that men marshalled on the Union side in Missouri in 1861 should be spoken of as well-disciplined and soldier-like. You emphasize the reference to Missouri as if it were a particularly good joke to speak of the Unionists of that State being creditable in a military point of view.

This almost reads like an outcropping of the denunciation of "Border-State loyalty" of which, during the war, Union men in the Border States heard so much from those who stayed comfortably at home in the Northern States. I know that you are not consciously unjust in this matter. It must be that you suppose yourself warranted in sneering at the courage and efficiency, in 1861, of the Union men of Missouri. These, however, were the men who, in May, 1861, took Camp Jackson; who in June, 1861, fought the battle of Boonville (where, however, the stand made by the rebels was not such as to lead to a serious contest); and who in August, under Lyon, Schofield, Granger, and others, fought, against great odds, the battle of Springfield, in which Lyon lost his life. But his army held the field, after losing nearly one-fourth of their number in killed and wounded. With the most trifling exception (there were less than 60 regulars), the men who fought this last battle were Missouri volunteers. If the army which met Beauregard at Manassas had shown anything like the same steadiness, the memory of that day would not have been a cause of humiliation and sinking of the heart to the whole

* He will kindly pass over the strange assertion that "the final victory of the American cause [in the War of Independence] was only (?) brought about by the regular French troops under Rochambeau (sic) and de Grasse" (p. 258).

country. Where, in all the United States, up to September, 1861, had any such good conduct and discipline been shown by the Union volunteers in Missouri? Not in Western Virginia, for there we greatly outnumbered the rebels; and surely not in Eastern Virginia.

It is unaccountable to me how it happens that such systematic injustice (if not systematic, at least constant) is done to Missouri by the press of the East. The New York papers of July 27 represented St. Louis as being in the hands and at the mercy of a mob, and the authorities as supinely yielding to the violence of the rioters. On the 26th the "authorities" of St. Louis, having summoned to their aid the volunteer citizen soldiers of the city (not volunteer companies already organized, for of these there were less than 150 men; but citizens having no organization whatever until Wednesday, July 25), and receiving on Thursday evening, July 26, from the governor of the State the arms which were until then lacking, perfected the arming of the St. Louis volunteers; and before the corresponding hour on Friday, July 27, every person engaged in the riots was either in flight or in prison. All this was done by the St. Louis police and the St. Louis citizen soldiers. But of this no trace appears in your last issue. You actually omit all mention of St. Louis when speaking of the places where proper resistance was made to the disorders of the last fortnight; and you do mention St. Louis when speaking of the places where the riot was raging. Now, we claim the benefit of one of two possible hypotheses. Either St. Louis was, throughout, free from disorder by reason of the law-abiding nature of her people, or order was restored there by her unassisted resources, without killing a man. The last is true. But no one could learn this from your columns, when professing to give the news of the past week. In fact, any reader of the *Nation* or the *World* would infer that the disorder in St. Louis continued unchecked, with the qualification that the *World* of the 30th of July represents St. Louis as being disturbed by a mob, which was "promptly suppressed" by Gen. Bates—the fact being that since July 27 there has been in St. Louis nothing which even exaggeration could call a mob; that the disturbance so "promptly suppressed" by Gen. Bates was in East St. Louis, Illinois, and not in St. Louis, Missouri; and that Gen. Bates is a citizen and a soldier of Illinois, and has never been in St. Louis, except in peaceful guise.—I am your obedient servant and constant reader,

THOS. T. GANTT.

ST. LOUIS, August 5, 1877.

[Our exact language, following Mahan, was "perfectly disciplined troops"; and, in spite of the honorable achievements of the Missouri levies, under such exceptional leadership as Gen. Lyon's, we must still hold to the belief that the very cream of our volunteer regiments could hardly, in a military sense, be called "perfectly disciplined" for a long time after June, 1861—say, even in June, 1863. Still, though we should not have turned to Missouri for examples of the highest discipline at the former date, we do not, on reflection, think that things were any looser there than elsewhere, as is implied in the phrase to which our correspondent takes exception.

As regards St. Louis during the strike, our correspondent has read our issue of Aug. 2 much too hastily. We simply said, in a very brief summary: "In Chicago there was rioting until Thursday, . . . and also in St. Louis and Peoria"; the inference being that quiet was restored on and after that date (July 26), or one day earlier than the date fixed by Judge Gantt. In enumerating the cities where the "regular forces of Government" proved sufficient to keep the peace, we omitted San Francisco and Pittsburgh as well as St. Louis, inasmuch as they all had to resort to "volunteer citizen soldiers—not volunteer companies already organized," and therefore no part of the "regular forces." For the mistakes and misrepresentations of the daily press of this city, which undertook to give minute and extended accounts of the strike, and were therefore peculiarly liable to error, we cannot of course be held responsible. That we were sometimes misled by them in making up our brief abstracts is quite possible; and since we have the floor on this subject, we may as well say here, in reply to the superintendent whose letter we printed last week, that the *Herald* of July 24 was our authority for the statement, not that the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad (with several other roads) "acceded to the demands of the strikers," but either acceded "or compromised with them in some way." According to the *Herald's* St. Louis despatch of July 23, the

road notified its employees on that day that "the wages recently reduced would be restored to the former figures on August 1."—ED. NATION.]

SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent, "C.," seems to feel kindly towards the South, but has evidently been misled by his "friend long resident in South Carolina" as to the nature and tendency of the recent legislation in relation to public schools and the University. This person may not have been an active politician, but the whole tenor of the extract from his letter shows that he sympathized very decidedly with those who no longer constitute "the dominant party" in this State. Every statement evinces prejudice against the new order of things. He can see nothing good in those who now control affairs, and hence gives an account of what the Legislature has done in relation to education suited to mislead any one who has no other information.

He recounts certain facts with a view to showing that the new Democratic Legislature is exceedingly hostile to the public schools, and is determined to get rid of the burden of educating the colored youth of the State. But these facts really establish no such propositions, but simply indicate that the method of collecting and disbursing the funds for the support of public education has been modified. It is true the Legislature has abolished special taxes and forbidden the local school-tax. The tax is assessed now as a whole, and goes into the public treasury. But it would be as sensible to conclude that the governor and other officers are in danger of receiving no salaries, because no special tax is laid for the purpose, as that the public schools are to be allowed to languish. In connection with his other statements, this gentleman should have stated also that this same Legislature had set apart the entire poll-tax, amounting at the very least to one hundred thousand dollars, for the maintenance of the public schools, and that it appropriated in addition one hundred thousand dollars for this purpose. This sum of not less than two hundred thousand dollars is to be apportioned by the school commissioners of the respective counties on the basis of the school attendance in the several counties for the last scholastic year (Acts and Joint Resolutions of the Gen. Assembly of S. C. passed at the Extra Session of 1877, p. 257). This appropriation may not be as large as many would like to see it; but when the impoverished condition of the State is taken into consideration, it would seem to show that the Legislature is disposed to do what it can.

It is also stated that the General Assembly "broke up the University and refused to pay the just claims of the teachers or professors." A few words as to what sort of institution has been broken up seem necessary here. Shortly after the government of South Carolina fell into the hands of the band of adventurers who have lately taken their departure, the honored members of the faculty of the University were quietly removed, for no other reason than that they differed from our rulers in politics, and the places were wanted for "loyal" men. A new faculty of approved political sentiments having been inducted, the doors of the institution were thrown open to colored youth as well as white. This, of course, caused the withdrawal of the patronage which had been the support of the college in the past, and the Legislature soon found it necessary to pay students for attending, as well as teachers for instructing. But even the payment of an annual bounty of two hundred dollars to each member of the college could not secure the attendance of more than a handful. The university dwindled into a mere day-school, and was found in this condition by the present administration. It is surely not strange that the new Legislature thought it necessary to make some change, seeing that the cost of maintaining the institution was as great as in its palmiest days. They did not, however, refuse to pay the professors. The Board of Trustees, at its recent meeting, recommended the payment of all the salaries in full, so that the members of the retiring Faculty will lose nothing.

But the Legislature did not leave the matter here. Seeing that the effort to educate the white and colored youth in the same institution had failed, as any rational man must have foreseen, an act was passed which provides in "Sec. 2. That his Excellency the Governor and the Board of Trustees, together with the Chairmen of the Committees on Education of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, shall constitute a Commission to enquire into and devise plans for the organization and maintenance of one university or college for the white and one for the colored youths of the State, which said universities or colleges shall be kept separate and apart, but shall for ever enjoy precisely the

same privileges and advantages with respect to their standards of learning and the amounts of revenue to be appropriated by the State for their maintenance" (Acts, etc., of General Assembly of South Carolina passed at Extra Session 1877, p. 315). When, therefore, the University of South Carolina is again opened for students, there will be an institution of precisely the same grade for colored youth. This does not look like unwillingness to provide for the education of the negro.

As to the alleged "expulsion of Northern teachers from Southern institutions of learning," it should be stated that no man has ever been expelled because he was born and educated beyond Mason and Dixon's line. There is probably not a single college of any standing in the South which has not had among the most honored members of its faculty men of Northern birth and education; and the same is true, to my certain knowledge, of many of these institutions at the present day. It would be well to distinguish between the carpet-bagger who plays professor and the true man of learning who comes South to cast in his lot, in good faith, with the people whom he aspires to educate.

In what was said about the *penalty* which the expulsion of Northern teachers carries with it, we feel inclined, from the general tone of the *Nation* and its fairness to the South, to believe that it was indulging in a bit of that irony which so often enlivens its pages. Regarded in this light, we are sure that all will regard it as an excellent joke. Any one who comes fully to understand what the carpet-bag professor has done for the South will be disposed to regard the penalty connected with his departure as of very much the same nature as that which the expulsion of his brother in politics has brought. We only wish people at the North knew more of our Southern institutions and those who teach in them. We believe that the great majority of those who dwell north of Mason and Dixon's line are inclined to feel kindly towards us and to appreciate the truth concerning us when they have learned it; and as all fair-minded persons are beginning to believe that we are capable of organizing and controlling governments for ourselves, and in the interests of all classes of our population, we trust the day is not far distant when they shall be ready to allow that there are men amongst us competent to the task of conducting institutions of learning of the highest grade without the assistance of those adventurers who, upon all occasions, bewail our ignorance and are constantly seeking to make themselves martyrs in the effort to enlighten us.

L.

COLUMBIA, S. C., August 8, 1877.

[As regards the University of South Carolina we leave the question where our correspondent leaves it, except that we know at least one of the retiring professors who cannot justly be reproached with incapacity or with the mercenary motives of the carpet-bagger, nor, we may add, with any illusions as to Southern ignorance, since he has taught elsewhere in the South. That the East Tennessee University expulsion is to be accounted for on the same grounds as the South Carolina, we cannot, with our present information, admit.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

THE Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its twenty-fifth meeting a year ago in Buffalo have been published in the usual full volume at Salem, Mass. Especially noteworthy are the addresses of Professors J. E. Hilgard and E. S. Morse. Among the numerous papers, that by Mr. John Muir on the Post-glacial History of *Sequoia gigantea* will be read with much interest by all who desire that this noble tree may not be exterminated. Mr. Muir describes its present range, accounts for the gaps in the line by reference to extinct glacial rivers, shows that it is not affected by drought, and that its roots gather water into bogs and even into running streams, that in Southern California it propagates itself freely, and that its enemies now are saw-mills and fires, for which last the "sheepherders" or "muttoners," as they are called, are even more culpable than careless mountaineers and lumbermen or the deer-hunting Indians.—The late Benjamin P. Hunt, of Philadelphia, who was a native of Massachusetts, and who died in February, bequeathed his invaluable collection of works relating to the West Indies, and particularly to Hayti, to the Boston Public Library. The twenty-fifth annual report of that institution, just issued, contains a short sketch of Mr. Hunt, who was an unostentatious but devoted friend of the colored race.—Brown University is taking the initiative in a reformation of the prevailing practice of bestowing degrees. The plan which it

submits to other colleges is reported to make the degree strictly the acknowledgment of a special literary performance. This may, we suppose, be a work composed without reference to academic honors, but the design is to stimulate the production of works for which such honors will be asked and granted if they prove worthy.—The reports made by the Venetian ambassadors at the various European courts to the home Government, as published by Barozzi and Berchet, have been found to contain most interesting matter regarding not merely the history but the manners and social condition of the countries reported upon—France, Spain, England, Piedmont, and Turkey—during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The despatches from the Papal Court at Rome, of which the first volume has just appeared, will certainly not be found of inferior interest.—A curious book has been published by Hachette of Paris: a selection of the themes of American scholars exhibited last year at Philadelphia. The selection was made by the President of the French Educational Commission sent to Philadelphia, but the translation is by another hand. The French *pensionnaires*, if the book ever finds its way into their hands, will no doubt be amused, and perhaps a little surprised, at the productions of their American cousins; as, for instance, the composition "On Paper," of a girl nine years old, who writes that, if there were no more paper, young ladies would receive no more love-letters—an assertion which shows that she was farther advanced in social than in paleographical science.

—Two correspondents have obligingly supplied us with the information which we lacked in regard to Victor's "History of the Rebellion," so highly praised by Dr. Mahan in his "Critical History of the American War" reviewed last week. It appears that the work was published in this city, probably by subscription (which would account for our never having met with it), in four volumes, royal octavo. The full title is "The History, Civil, Political, and Military, of the Southern Rebellion, from its inception to its close; comprehending also all important State papers, ordinances of secession, proclamations, proceedings of Congress, official reports of commanders, etc.," by Orville J. Victor. The first volume bears on its title-page the date of 1861. One of our correspondents, a bookseller, had seen no other. He writes that he had always supposed the work to be more rare than valuable. On the other hand, we are assured that "any collection of books relating to the Rebellion which lacks it is deficient indeed; for, whilst I do not agree with Dr. Mahan as to its superior ability, it is in many respects without an equal, and merits the attention of military students who desire to possess a better idea of the different movements in their relation to the final struggle."

—Mr. J. A. Allen's learned and exhaustive monograph on the "American Bisons, Living and Extinct," which was originally printed in a small edition as part of the Memoirs of the Geographical Survey of Kentucky, has been, with Professor Shaler's and Mr. Allen's permission, reprinted in the ninth volume of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey, and again separately from the same plates. This has been done under the editorship of Dr. Coues, who has incorporated the appendices with the text, and has brought the whole essay within popular bounds by omitting the portion relating to extinct species. The author has besides added some new matter. The former habitat of the bison on this continent extended from latitude 62° N. (Great Slave Lake) to 25° N. (northeastern provinces of Mexico). Its recent remains have been found in Oregon as far west as the Blue Mountains. Its extreme range in the northeast was the region about Buffalo. Elsewhere, east of the Mississippi, except certain parts of Pennsylvania and Virginia, it was "restricted to the area drained by the Ohio and Illinois Rivers and their tributaries, and the lesser eastern tributaries of the Mississippi in Northern Wisconsin and Minnesota." It was not found south of the Tennessee River. The buffalo has now only a range extending northward from the sources of the principal southern tributaries of the Yellowstone into the British possessions, and another in Western Kansas, a part of the Indian Territory, and Northwestern Texas. This division into two bands was caused by the overland emigration to California in 1849. The railroads have since contributed to their wholesale destruction, and as no steps have been taken to prevent their extermination, the days of the wild buffalo are probably numbered. In the four months following the opening of the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fé Railroad (September 23, 1872) to Dodge City, more than a hundred thousand buffaloes were killed in the neighborhood of that town for the sake of their hides and saddles. How many more were wantonly destroyed by "sportsmen" can only be conjectured. As the Indians who supplied the fur-traders used to kill two millions a year, it is only surprising that the buffalo did not long since become extinct, and that one may still see herds which blacken the earth as far as the eye can take in the landscape. Remembering that "rarely is more than a single herd

produced at a birth," the period of gestation being nine months, we can from the multiplication of this animal better appreciate the assertion of Darwin that "the elephant, the slowest breeder of all known animals, would in a few thousand years stock the whole world."

—What Mr. Allen has to say about the domestication of the buffalo is of great interest and full of encouragement for those who would undertake it. The cross between the bison and the native and short-horn cattle promises great results for the dairy. As we may yet hope to see the Indians employed as herdsmen, the experiment of domestication on a grand scale may well be made by them in the vicinity of the southern range of the buffalo. Our minister at the Court of St. James has recently forwarded to the Secretary of State a copy of a letter addressed to the Aborigines' Protection Society by a Mr. Wilson, who is described by the London press as "the well-known Australian colonist." Taking for granted the extirpation of the buffalo, he wonders "why the Americans, in their difficulties with the native Indians, have not endeavored to educate them in the cultivation and breeding of cattle as a most natural substitute for the buffalo." He refers to the good service amongst the Australian cattle which he has seen rendered by convicts of very inferior character and by the native aborigines of Australia, as a precedent for similarly employing our Indians. We hope his prompting will not be unheeded by the Government, and that the desirability of preserving the buffalo will also be taken into account.

—"Historical Maxims for Troubled Times" was the subject of an address delivered by Gen. J. D. Cox before the Yale Law School at its last Commencement, and now printed in pamphlet form. The speaker's aim was to review in general terms the reconstruction period just closed, to point out how far the maxims of history were disregarded in the heat and passion of our political settlement, and to admonish his hearers, about to enter their professional life, to qualify themselves by the study of history for the part they would probably play in the political conduct and education of the country. He justified the President's Southern "policy," without alluding to it, when he said: "Another maxim constantly recurring in history and almost as constantly forgotten in troubled times, is that, under institutions at all free, solid peace can only be built upon the general consent of the governed, and especially upon the assent and support of the classes which include the intelligence, the energy, and the capital of the community in a preponderating degree." General Cox might have added that this maxim is, in this country, persistently overlooked even when the times are not troubled, and that if it ever obtained the assent of the classes he refers to, we should witness some experiments towards the restriction and elevation of the suffrage that would do more than any other one thing to ward off trouble. When we see attempts making in Georgia to disfranchise non-taxpayers and petty thieves, we may feel that prejudice against the negro sustains, and to some extent directs, the movement, but we must confess that if non-taxpayers and the "dangerous classes" could be kept from the polls in our Northern States also, we should be infinite gainers by such a deliverance. When, again, we see, in General Cox's own State, the Democratic Convention demanding the repeal of the registry law because it is "burdensome and expensive, and discriminates unjustly against the poorer class of voters"—i.e., the very ones through whom frauds are perpetrated—it is impossible not to be struck with the analogy between such views of the suffrage and the trades-unionism of the present day. Government, it would seem, is to be carried on in the interest of the lowest members of society, just as business must be conducted in the interest of the least skillful and laziest mechanics and laborers, and in both cases on terms dictated by them. We doubt, in fact, if the workingman will listen to any but his own definition of the "rights" of labor so long as the "right" of suffrage is conceded to every one who claims it, and conceded the more obsequiously the less fitted he is to exercise it.

—The twenty-fifth annual report of the Boston Public Library, including summaries of its past history and experiences, has been commented upon not altogether favorably by the Boston press. There is always a smothered discontent with any city institution; and as the largest library in the country cannot be maintained without cost, it is natural that its expensiveness should be complained of in a city which has suffered heavily by fire, and still more grievously by insolvent railroads; which sees itself condemned by necessity to heavy disbursements for improved sewerage, by pride to lavish outlay on a park system capable of indefinite expansion, and by politics to a permanent drain upon her resources in keeping up free ferries. The Boston *Herald* calls attention to "the slowly-growing belief that the library is approaching the maximum of expenditure that

the city can wisely devote to this purpose. The cost of maintaining it is advancing much faster than the taxable wealth of the city, while the increase in circulation is in no small degree due to the unpopular enactment which reduces the time during which a book can be retained from a fortnight to a week." The critic then speaks of the purchase of the Barton Shakspeare library as simply throwing away money, because the collection is of no popular value. Objection is made also to the expensively illustrated works and rare foreign editions that are not allowed to circulate, and the trustees are warned not to attempt to make a great and symmetrical library so much as to supply the people with the mental food they desire. The article is written with moderation, and there may possibly be some justice in the complaints, and yet we fancy the managers could present a satisfactory reply.

—They might say, for instance, that they are between two millstones: that the library has always been very freely blamed for being too "popular," for buying too much of Oliver Optic and Horatio Alger and Mrs. Southworth. They might urge that they have more than \$100,000 of trust funds, given, in nearly every case, to be spent "in the purchase of books of permanent value," and that the city appropriations for books have been almost religiously used "to supply the people with the mental food they desire." They might suggest that scholars are a part of the people and have some rights, and that any one of the "people" may develop the tastes of a scholar; that, in fact, this is one of the purposes for which the library was established, one of the chief ends at which it has always been aiming; that, moreover, a large part of the works to which the critic objects are gifts, and many more such will be given, in single volumes, in small collections, and in whole libraries, if it is understood that they will be welcomed and well cared for, and not thought out of place there; that if Boston desires to see costly donations turn away from the doors of her library and seek other resting-places, where a kinder reception is promised, she has only to make it clearly understood that she does not desire "expensively illustrated works, rare foreign editions, and books which from their great rarity cannot be given out to the public," or that if she accepts them as gifts she grudges the money which it takes to house and catalogue and care for them. And let her add that she does this because none of her inhabitants desire or can assimilate the mental food which such works offer. Such a declaration, though somewhat premature, would not be altogether out of accord with the change which is slowly creeping over the character of that city.

—The story about the alleged recovery of the lost arms of the Venus of Milo appeared in the French papers in a somewhat different form from that which was transmitted to this country by Mr. Meredith Read. It was only one arm that had been found by the pupils of the French school at Athens, and very near the place where the statue was discovered in 1820—one marble arm holding a mirror. And the story, traced back to the Athens paper in which it first appeared, and thence to the original authority, is limited to the actual finding of a marble hand and wrist holding a round object like a fruit, and no more likely to belong to the Venus of Milo than is any one of the thousand fragments of marble which brief research might be expected to bring to light in the island of Melos. At a recent meeting of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, in Paris, a letter was read from the director of the Athens school contradicting the story, and at the same meeting M. Ravaissou, who is, or recently was, custodian of the antique and modern sculpture in the Louvre, exhibited a drawing of the different pieces of the statue, made at the time of its discovery by an officer of the ship-of-war *Eslafette*, which rescued the statue from the Turks. M. Ravaissou's argument seems to have been that the arms were not with the statue when it was found in Melos; because there was M. Voutier's drawing of all the pieces existing at the time. As our readers are aware, M. Ravaissou is the author and stanch supporter of a theory that the Venus of Milo was grouped with a statue of Mars, the whole group representing Venus persuading Mars to cease from conflict, and to disarm. And this theory, it seems from the report of the proceedings of the meeting of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, he still holds, and has new evidence to prove. The Mars Borghèse seems to M. Ravaissou the type of the statue which should complete the group, though that particular statue is on a smaller scale than the Venus of Milo. The question is of great interest, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Stillman will publish the monograph he proposes, supporting a theory so widely different.

—'Pädagogische Studien' is the title of a series of brief essays upon education, edited by Dr. Wilhelm Rein of Eisenach, the place of publica-

tion. Part of the essays are by the editor, part by other writers: the sixth, published a few months ago, is "Zur Pädagogik des Mittelalters," by Dr. Karl Just of Leipzig. It contains 48 pages, and consists of five chapters: the education of noble boys, knightly education as contrasted with priestly, the education of girls of rank, children's plays, and punishments. They are interesting papers, copiously illustrated with extracts from German poets of the Middle Ages, but with the defect of not taking sufficient pains to indicate the period referred to, for they cover the ground of nearly a thousand years. The most valuable paper is perhaps the second, which describes the formal lifeless system of education in the schools under ecclesiastical influence, and compares it with the free and inspiring methods by which boys of rank were trained in castles, under the immediate influence of the lord and lady of the castle; this he shows to have anticipated some of the features of modern education, but to have been deficient in the direction of self-control—an education, we may suppose, which had many of the merits and of the defects, in its influence upon character, of the life upon our Southern plantations.

MORGAN'S "ANCIENT SOCIETY."*

II.

THE last link in the gentile series of the Iroquois, the highest point reached, is the confederacy of tribes. Here again the strictly democratic character appears in some of its general features, as, for instance: Perfect independence of each tribe in matters pertaining to local self-government; a general council of sachems for the confederacy; unanimity in the council requisite; no chief executive magistrate; two head-chiefs for warlike purposes elected, with equal powers, so as to counteract at once any tendency of a single individual to reach extraordinary power. There can be no doubt as to the truth of the picture presented by Mr. Morgan of the organization of the Iroquois and their institutions. He has extended his researches over the remainder of the North American Indians, and has established the existence of the gens among nearly all of them. Even the names of the gentes of more than thirty tribes scattered over the entire area of the United States and of Canada are given. They are mostly taken from animals, as among the Iroquois. All of these tribes belonged or belong still to an inferior condition of mankind. Either they are roving savages or at best sedentary Indians of the lower order, limited horticulturists, or rather hunters with a fixed abode for a longer period of time, since the female portion of the tribe increased the means of subsistence at a given place through their garden-culture. But besides them Mr. Morgan gives us the gentile organization of the Moqui and Laguna, two sedentary Indian tribes of the higher order of New Mexico—whose dwellings, large communal houses of adobe and stone—are permanent, who subsist exclusively upon agriculture, and who (like the other tribes of the "pueblos") when first met by the Spaniards were described by them as "living in cities larger than Mexico."

The fact that the Lagunas and Moquis are organized after the gentile system certainly suggests the possibility that the tribes of Mexico and Central America, at the time of the conquest, were in a similar condition. Mr. Morgan indeed adduces some evidence to the effect that the Maya of Yucatan had the gens, with descent in the male line. It is, moreover, proved by Bienvenida that they practised communism in living, and when, in 1698, the last Maya pueblo (Tayasal on Lake Peten) fell into the hands of the Spanish general Ursua they found "each house occupied by an entire relationship." These are further evidences in favor of his views. The "Popol-Vuh," or so-called holy book of the Quiché of Guatemala, although to some extent a work of doubtful authenticity, reveals, in that part of it which embodies undoubtedly genuine Indian traditions, the organization of the Quiché tribe, of which Fuentes, and after him Juarros, and also Stephens, have made an empire. Four gentes (houses) originally constitute the tribe; these are shown to subdivide into twenty-four, while they themselves remain as four phratries. It is, besides, established by authorities of great weight that the Quiché were led not by one, but by four chiefs, and that the office was elective. This carries still further the analogy with the typical institutions of the Iroquois. Nothing is wanted but the tribal confederacy to complete the series of gentile society. This confederacy Mr. Morgan has found beyond a doubt in Mexico.

It would require too much space to discuss at length his chapter on the "Aztec confederacy," although the name employed by him is incorrect,

since the Aztecs formed but one tribe of the three who mastered in conjunction the valley of Mexico. His application of the principles of gentilism to the Mexican tribes in general is certainly very successful, and we recognize at once how erroneous has been the impression of their condition heretofore conveyed. We can safely predict that a further investigation of the details of their society will reveal all the features common to the other Indian tribes just noticed. The gens is found in the military organization of the Mexicans, in their tenure of lands by "calpules," in their communal plan of living. The phratry is established beyond a doubt through the principal "quarters" of their pueblo. A confederacy, for purposes of warfare, with a common war-chief of the Mexicans, and nothing else, at its head, takes the place of the empire, of the state or nation of Anahuac. The Mexican nobles and princes will, we are very certain, reduce themselves to elective chiefs, and the head-power in each tribe will ultimately appear in the council of chiefs, to whose decisions the head-chief had to submit. There are many points yet left in doubt, but the fundamental character of Mexican institutions is fixed beyond any cavil through Mr. Morgan. These institutions were yet barbarous, but certainly democratic, and neither despotic nor monarchical. The Mexicans had progressed far beyond the Iroquois, descent was probably in the male line among them, their organization was more complicated; but from this to a "high ancient civilization," analogous to the status of Asiatic empires, there is yet a wide step.

From what has been said we must expect Mr. Morgan to extend his investigations also to the South American Indians. His information on this point, however, appears to have been limited. In vain do we look for many remarkable proofs extant of the general prevalence of gentilism among the aborigines of South America, such as the (31) gentes of the Uaupés (between the Rio Uaupés and Amazonas), who, with equal propriety, might have styled themselves "people of the long house"—like the Iroquois. As early as 1507 (the date of the first printing of his letters) Amerigo Vespucci tells us of the large communal huts of the inhabitants of northern Venezuela. Molina (Abbé F. X.) pictures to us the democratic institutions of the Araucans, their elective chieftains, the council of chiefs leading their tribal affairs. He even mentions one of the fundamental attributes of the gens—the right to mutual help and assistance. Of the sedentary village Indians of New Granada, the Muyscas, we are told by Gomara, by Pedro Simon, Piedrahita, and García, that descent was in the female line, as among the Iroquois. Lastly, in Peru, Polo de Ondegardo describes the communal tenure of the soil by kin. Even the latest investigations have fully established the fact that the dwellings all over the "land of the Incas" were joint tenement-houses analogous to those of Zúñi, Laguna, and Moqui. Still, the Peruvian aborigines had attained a higher degree of development even than the Mexicans, since by the side of the organization by kin (into "ayllus," or lineages, or gentes) we find already for warlike purposes another one based on numbers after the decimal system.

We state these facts merely to indicate that there is in South America overwhelming evidence of the truth of Mr. Morgan's views. His investigations have thus at least established American ethnology on a firm basis, furnishing reliable guides for the study not only of the ethnography, but also of the aboriginal history of the entire Indian branch of the human family. Reverting to other continents, Mr. Morgan demonstrates the existence of the gens among a large portion of the aborigines of Africa. In India it is found very plainly; remnants of it are yet visible in the Chinese Empire and among the Mongol tribes. Lastly, the Irish sept, the Scottish clan, are in Europe unmistakable representatives of it, while it is still vigorous in Bosnia and Bulgaria, coupled with the communal plan of living. The ancient Hebrews are shown to have had the gens, the phratry, and the tribe. An extended discussion of the gens, phratry, and tribe among the Greeks and Romans occupies a large portion of the "Growth of the Idea of Government." The subject is of very great importance, but we can only call attention to the remarkable concordance existing between the functions of the gens among the Iroquois and those of the Roman gens especially, and to the description given of the change from gentile society to political society, among Greeks as well as among Romans. How far the picture drawn by Mr. Morgan is correct we leave to students of classical antiquity to determine.

The third part, "Growth of the Idea of the Family," lies without the scope of this review. It involves the question of primitive marriage, which has latterly become an object not only of discussion but even of strife. We regret to see that in England this discussion has not been always conducted with the regard due to the real merits of Mr. Morgan's labors, which, while the British scientific world would be proud of them

* "Ancient Society; or, Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism into Civilization." By Lewis H. Morgan. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1877.

had they not been performed by an American, have not even received due courtesy, ordinary fairness and justice.

For a satisfactory understanding of the fourth part, "Growth of the Idea of Property," one must resort to the researches on the gens. So far as the American aborigines are concerned, the communal tenure of lands, for instance, appears as an established fact among most of the sedentary tribes. In regard to Mexico, however, we are at liberty to state that detailed researches are now being made which should establish, in a satisfactory way, the manner of holding the soil on the part of its aboriginal inhabitants. They may not in every respect confirm the ideas advanced by our author, but their general results will only strengthen the general principles laid down by him.

BAPTISTS AND QUAKERS.*

ON the surface no religious sects would seem to have less in common than the two which are grouped together in the above title. They represent, in some respects at least, the most divergent extremes of that enormous variety of practice and opinion which renders the real value of the great Protestant Reformation still a matter of so much dispute. While the Quaker exalts the spirit, the Baptist has always made a boast of adhering more closely than any other body of Christian believers to the very letter of the Written Word. In his revolt from all external rites and ceremonies the Quaker has refused compliance with the plainest commands of the Founder of Christianity, while the Baptist has strained language to make literal obedience to at least one injunction an imperative test of Christian fellowship. In his reverence for the inner light the Quaker has discarded any formal creed; he has ranked the authority of Scripture beneath that of the individual consciousness; he has eschewed emotion as an ingredient of religious experience; content for the most part with an indirect influence upon others, he has not been spurred, even by the prospect of gradual extinction, to any systematic effort of religious propagandism; while, on the other hand, the Baptist has been the zealous assertor of a pronounced dogmatic system; he has exalted the Bible as the only source of religious truth; he has eagerly lent himself to the most exciting appliances of the modern revivalist; he has been characterized by an intense denominational spirit, which has naturally been quickened by a great numerical increase.

Yet with all these external differences nothing is more certain than the fact that these two religious bodies proceeded from the same impulse, and that during their early stages they had very much in common. George Fox, who, if not the founder of Quakerism, did more than any other man to fix its distinctive outlines, derived his earliest religious impressions from the Baptists, and constantly associated with them both before and after entering upon his unique career. He had an uncle who was a Baptist, his first sermon was preached to a Baptist congregation, and throughout his life, both in England and in this country, he was strongly attracted towards them. No attentive reader of his "Journal" can have failed to note how constantly he sought among them his first-fruits. The great majority of the early converts to his doctrine were drawn from among the Baptists. The resemblances between the two sects were very striking. Both earnestly insisted that the church was a society of equals, and consequently refused to recognize any distinctive clerical class. Both denied the civil government any right of interference in religious matters at a time when this right was acknowledged by all the reformed churches without exception. Both objected to the use of anything but Scripture phrases to define the essence and attributes of the Infinite Being. In matters of minor moment the likeness was not less marked. Both disapproved strongly of instrumental music; both agreed in the disuse of "heathen names" of days and months; both discarded the pronoun "you," as used in the singular number; both testified strongly against superfluity of apparel; both disciplined members for marrying out of the sect; both recognized the right of women to preach; both denounced learning as a qualification of the religious teacher. In short, the language which Pepys uses in his diary as descriptive of the Quakers, "a melancholy, proudsort of people, and exceedingly ignorant," might be applied to either sect.

The author of this monograph has rendered a service in calling attention to these curious resemblances, but he is manifestly wrong in asserting so strongly that Quakerism was mainly a copy and continuation of the Baptist system. The truth is that one did not spring from the other, but

both were products of the great religious fermentation of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. Had Mr. Tallack made a little more philosophical study of his subject, he would not have missed so obvious a fact. The subsequent history of the two sects shows plainly enough that one was not a mere continuation of the other. The Baptists, in all their history, have produced no such genuine religious genius as George Fox; and we may search the whole body of their denominational literature in vain for a theological treatise that will bear comparison with the eloquent and spiritual "Apology" of Robert Barclay. The later history, indeed, of the two religious movements, in their origin so much alike, affords much matter for reflection. The Quakers, rejecting all external badges of communion, and reducing religion to a spiritual experience, have almost ceased to exist; the Baptists, insisting on a form, and refusing to recognize a religious faith incapable of concrete expression, have enormously increased. It would almost seem as if a religion like that taught to Nicodemus and professed by John were unsuited to the coarser wants of average human nature, and that the aid of some external signs were necessary to make its appeal successful with the mass of men. It cannot be denied that the one simple rite on which the Baptists have everywhere insisted has been an element of singular strength in the great popular influences of the denomination.

Beyond this single feature, Mr. Tallack's volume has very little value. It is a compilation made with no great skill, and containing considerable matter only remotely connected with his subject. To show the resemblance between the Quakers and the early Baptists it was hardly necessary to enumerate all the members of the Society of Friends, in modern times, who have prospered in trade, or who have aided in promoting the temperance reform. The author's own reflections, when not inapposite, are usually commonplace. As a study of the character and career of George Fox, the essay is singularly inadequate—no facts are presented which cannot be gathered from the most common biographies. The author possesses neither the intellectual nor the literary qualifications requisite for delineating the singular enthusiast whose making to himself a suit of leather was of more significance, Sartor Resartus says, than the Diet of Worms, or the battle of Waterloo, Peterloo, or any other battle. In Fox's "Journal," and in his controversial writings, there is rich material for such a portrait, but Mr. Tallack has not known how to use it. The portions of the book which relate to Fox's experiences in this country are especially unsatisfactory. The extent of the author's acquaintance with the religious history of New England may be inferred from his remark respecting the Massachusetts Puritans who flogged and hung the Quakers, that "they were Episcopalians and not Nonconformists." Governor Endicott would have stood aghast at such a statement. Mr. Tallack has evidently never heard of the Cambridge Platform, and never read John Cotton's "Way of the Congregational Churches Cleared." The most striking episode in Fox's American career was his controversy with Roger Williams. Mr. Tallack refers to this, but a more careful study of the curious literature connected with it would have supplied him with some additional illustrations of the analogy between the Quakers and the early Baptists, while at the same time it would have shown with how little reason Roger Williams has been identified with the latter sect.

Epochs of Ancient History. The Athenian Empire. By George W. Cox, M.A., joint editor of the series. With five maps. (New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 12mo, pp. 257.)—The fault of this book is one of proportion. It covers a period of about seventy-five years, including the very culmination of Grecian art and literature, and the career of the most triumphant democracy in history; but five chapters out of seven—three-quarters of the entire text—are taken up with the history of the Peloponnesian war, the melancholy downfall of the empire. From the title one expects the central figure to be Pericles, and the leading topic the Athenian constitution at this period of its glory; a careful statement of the relation of Athens to the allied cities, first in the confederacy of Delos, and then when the confederacy was converted into an empire; the causes of disaffection among the allies, and of the weakening of the power of the ruling city. The Peloponnesian War one would expect to be only an incident, or the instructive termination of a dominion founded upon injustice. The defence, of course, would be that in the period of this war the historian has the invaluable aid of Thucydides, and that the proportion of the book is controlled by the proportion of the materials. This is a sufficient justification for an encyclopædic history like Grote's; one who undertakes to give all that is known of the history of a country must perforce be more voluminous where the authorities are fuller. But

* "George Fox, the Friends, and the Early Baptists." By William Tallack. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

even in Grote the reader feels that the perfection of the book as a work of literature is impaired by this; and in a mere sketch, such as Mr. Cox's, there is no reason for suffering the relative abundance of materials to govern the plan, rather than the relative importance of periods. There would have been enough to say of the Athenian Empire in its glory to fill five chapters out of seven, and leave two to treat of its overthrow. With this defect the book has great merits; Mr. Cox is master of his subject, and has the power of using his materials to excellent purpose. As a history of the Peloponnesian War the book is admirable.

Hours with Men and Books. By William Mathews, LL.D. (Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1877. 1 vol., pp. 284.)—This book is one which calls for brief notice under several heads; and happily it is one which will review itself very well. Mr. Mathews tells us as a critic, for instance, that Thomas de Quincey was "one of the greatest scholars and thinkers of our century," and that his prose is "the most passionately eloquent, the most thoroughly poetical prose, our language has produced." As to talking, he could talk about anything; "it mattered little what was the theme of his high argument; whether bees or butterflies, St. Basil or Æschylus." Clearly Mr. Mathews has himself no small ear for style, and he recognizes very clearly its value; "a tremendous thought," he says, "may be packed into a small compass, made as solid as a cannon-ball, and cut down everything before it" (p. 259). Thus, he says that "America is the grand asylum and home of humanity, where people of every race and clime under the whole heaven may stand erect on one unvarying plane of political and religious equality" (p. 306). As a moralist he is severe upon "the Jesuitical doctrine of Infidelity's latest champion, Renan," as he writes the name of "this

unblushing apostle of fraud." But Mr. Mathews has his sportive moments too, even while he castigates the unorthodox; thus, in his censure of Hume we may appreciate the lighter play of his mind: "What truth," he asks, "could be expected of a historian who wrote lying—on a sofa?" And yet in spite of this lightness rigorous science is by no means alien to Mr. Mathews, as shown by his remark that "in our animal economy it is a disastrous policy to eat exclusively the nitrates which contribute to the muscles, the phosphates which feed the brain and nerves, or the carbonates which develop fat" (p. 151). But we may not linger over the merits of this book; we must find space to say that it is, for the most part, a collection of well-worn and about literary men, strung upon lines of thought that are more than commonly commonplace.

* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

Authors.—Titles.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Publishers.—Prices.

Adams (C. F.), Memoir of John Quincy Adams, Vol. XII. (J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Bartlett (Mrs. J. M. D.), Until the Day Break: a Tale. (Porter & Coates)	\$1.25
Clarke (H. L.) and Wake (C. S.), Serpent and Siva Worship, swd. (J. W. Bouton)	25
Cunningham (Rev. W.), On the Epistle of St. Barnabas. (Macmillan & Co.)	25
Duclot (A.), Jack: a Tale. (Estes & Lauriat)	1.50
Dugdale (R. L.), "The Jukes," 3d ed. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1.25
Farrar (Rev. F. W.), Life of Christ, Paris 9-13, swd. (Hassell, Pettor & Galpin)	25
Folsom (Dr. C. F.), Disease of the Mind. (A. Williams & Co.)	1.25
Hamilton (Mrs. C. V.), My Bounte Lass, swd. (Estes & Lauriat)	50
Heron (D. C.), Jurisprudence and its Relation to the Social Sciences. (Hurd & Houghton)	1.50
Kent (J.), The Johnson Manor. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	62.50
Leeds (J. W.), History of the United States. (J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	2.50
Mitchell (Dr. S. W.), Fat and Blood. (J. W. Bouton)	25
Michelot (J.), The Bible of Humanity. (J. W. Bouton)	1.25
Perkins (F. B.), My Three Conversations with Miss Chester, swd. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	25
Smart (H.), Two Kisses: a Tale, swd. (A. K. Loring)	50
Symonds (J. A.), Renaissance in Italy, 3 vols. (Smith, Elder & Co.)	5.00
Wolf (C.), Historischer Atlas, Part III, swd. (L. W. Schmidt)	1.50

Leisure-Hour Series.

(16mo, \$1.25 each.)

RECENT VOLUMES.

VIRGIN SOIL. IN CHANGE UNCHANGED.
LOLA. POET AND MERCHANT.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

DAVIS, BARDEEN & CO.,

Syracuse, N. Y., publish 'The Regents' Questions,' Beebe's 'First Steps with Figures,' Roe's 'A Work in Number,' De Graff's 'School-Room Guide,' Hoese's 'Studies in Articulation,' Frohisher's 'Good Selections for Reading,' Bardeen's 'Common-School Law,' Johannot's 'School-Houses,' Tillinghast's 'Diadem of School Songs,' De Graff's 'Institute Song Budget,' several 'School Records,' etc., etc.

Send two stamps for catalogue and specimen copy of the *School Bulletin*.

BACK NUMBERS AND COM-

plete sets of all the leading MAGAZINES and REVIEWS for sale cheap, at the American and Foreign Magazine Depot, 24 Dey Street, New York City.

OLD BOOKS, RARE, VALUABLE, and Curious. Priced Catalogue No. 14 free on application to JOHN EVANS, Importer and Bookseller, 21 Park Row, New York City.

Continued from page iv.

PENNSYLVANIA, Bethlehem.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY.—Tuition free. Civil, Mechanical, and Mining Engineering; Chemistry and Metallurgy; full Classical Instruction; French and German; English Literature; International and Constitutional Law; Psychology and Christian Evidences.

For registers address

The Rev. JOHN M. LEAVITT, D.D., President.

PENNSYLVANIA, Chester.

PENNSYLVANIA MILITARY ACADEMY opens September 12. Location healthful; grounds ample; buildings commodious. Thorough instruction in Civil Engineering, the Classics, and English.

Careful supervision of Cadets.

For circulars apply to Col. THEO. HYATT, President.

PENNSYLVANIA, Downingtown, Chester Co.

M. B. THOMAS SISTERS. formerly Mary B. Thomas & Sisters', School. The fall term will begin 17th, ninth mo. (Sept.), 1877.

PENNSYLVANIA, Germantown.

GERMANTOWN ACADEMY will commence its 117th school year Sept. 10, 1877, under entirely new management, the following officers having been elected by the Board of Trustees:

WM. KERSHAW, A.M., Principal;

M. C. KIMBER, Vice-Principal.

Every exertion will be made to restore the former high standard and reputation of the Academy, and to render it in all respects a thorough training school for our best colleges and universities.

Applications to be addressed to WM. KERSHAW, Principal, Apsley Street, Germantown.

PENNSYLVANIA, Germantown.
MADAME CLEMENT'S SCHOOL for Young Ladies and Children—Established in 1857. The Fall Session will begin on Wednesday, Sept. 19. For circulars apply to the Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Germantown, West Chelten Avenue, below Wayne Street.
MISS MARY E. STEVENS'S, formerly Miss Mary E. Aertsen and Miss Mary E. Stevens', School for Young Ladies, will reopen Sept. 19, 1877. Scholars prepared for the Harvard Examinations for Women.

PENNSYLVANIA, Haverford College P. O.
HAVERFORD COLLEGE, under the care of the Society of Friends (Orthodox). THOS. CHASE, A.M., Pres. For catalogues address Prof. S. ALSON, Jr.

PENNSYLVANIA, Media, Delaware Co., thirteen miles from Philadelphia.
BROOKE HALL Female Seminary opens September 17. For catalogues apply to M. L. EASTMAN, Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Media.
\$65 PER QUARTER (no extra charges) for Young Men and Boys, at Shortlidge's Media Academy. Ten instructors—two graduates of Yale College. Special individual instruction for both advanced and backward pupils. Recommended by Mr. Bayard Taylor, Judge Van Hoesen, and others. Open all summer. Media has seven churches and a temperance charter. Address

S. C. SHORTLIDGE (Harvard A.M.), Media, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA, Mt. Pleasant.
WEST PENNA. CLASSICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTE. For both sexes. New building for ladies. Open grate in each room. Address JONATHAN JONES, A.M.

PENNSYLVANIA, Nazareth, Northampton Co.
NAZARETH HALL.—Boarding-School for Boys.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 1527 and 1529 Spruce Street.
CHEGARAY INSTITUTE (Founded 1814), for Young Ladies and Misses, reopens September 20. Board and tuition in Latin, English, and French, per annum, \$400. French is the language of the family. Madame D'HERVILLE, Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 1350 Pine Street.
MISS ANABLE'S BOARDING and DAY School will reopen Sept. 19.

PENNSYLVANIA, Pottstown, Montgomery Co.
COTTAGE SEMINARY for Young Ladies.—The twenty-eighth annual session begins on the 18th Sept., 1877. For catalogues, apply to GEO. G. RUTLER, A.M., Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Pottstown, Montgomery Co.
"THE HILL" SCHOOL—Preparatory to College and University.—Twenty-seventh year begins Sept. 4. Superior location, equipment, library, gymnasium. Careful supervision and home culture. Designed to give thorough and critical preparation for college. References: President Porter, Yale College; President Cattell, Lafayette; President McCosh, Princeton; Justice Strong, U. S. Supreme Court.

JOHN MEIGS, Ph.D., Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Swarthmore, Delaware Co., 10 miles from Philadelphia.
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, under care of Friends, gives a thorough collegiate education: both sexes, who pursue the same courses of study and receive the same degrees. Total expenses, including tuition, board, washing, use of books, etc., \$250 a year. No extra charges. For catalogue giving full particulars as to courses of study, etc., address

EDWARD H. MAGILL, President.

PENNSYLVANIA, West Chester.
MISS SMITH'S SCHOOL for Young Ladies reopens Sept. 19. Eight young ladies will be received into the family. Address P. FRANK SMITH.

TEXAS, Henderson.
HENDERSON COLLEGE—Gentlemen in the Southwest who desire to have their sons thoroughly educated, or prepared for any of the Eastern universities, should address OSCAR H. COOPER, B.A. (Yale), Principal.

VERMONT, Bellows Falls.
ST. AGNESS HALL—A Church School for Girls. Miss JANE HATGOOD, Principal. See Nation, No. 632.

VIRGINIA, P. O. University of Va.
UNIVERSITY OF VA.—Law Department. Send for catalogue to WM. WESTENBANKER, Sec'y Faculty.

VIRGINIA, Salem, Roanoke Co. (in the Mountains).
ROANOKE COLLEGE.—Expenses for 1877-78, \$150 to \$240. College prosperous. For catalogue address Secretary of Faculty.

WISCONSIN, Kenosha.
KEMPER HALL—A Collegiate School for Girls and Young Ladies. The next school year begins Thursday, September 6. At no time in its history has the school been able to offer such advantages as it now does in every department.

Apply for circular to the Rev. GEO. M. EVERHART, D.D., Rector.

WISCONSIN, Racine (on the Lake Shore).
RACINE COLLEGE begins September 5. The College and Grammar School open the same day. For catalogues, apply to the Rev. JAMES DE ROYER, D.D.

Wants.

A LADY of much experience as a successful teacher is very anxious for employment. From past experience, is prepared to teach in an asylum, in a public or private school, or as governess. Can teach English and music (vocal and instrumental). Has very good testimonials. Please address TEACHER, 42 Front Street, Newark, N. J.

A PRIVATE TUTOR, with good reference and four years' experience as tutor at Harvard, wishes private pupils. Address J., 4 Wadsworth House, Cambridge, Mass.

A TEACHER (Harvard Graduate), who has had several years' experience in one of the best private classical schools in Boston, wishes a position in a High School or Academy. Best of references. Address TEACHER, 128 E. Street, Boston, Mass.

TO LAWYERS.—Wanted, by a young member of N. Y. City Bar of nine years' standing, a position as junior partner, chief clerk, or otherwise, in a law office. He believes himself to be energetic and competent; has practised in all the courts; is a member of N. Y. Law Institute and from Harvard Law School; has office furniture and books; is 30 years old; is desirous of locating permanently with family away from N. Y. City because of climate. Address LAWYER, care C. E. Huntington, 68 Fulton Street, N. Y. City.

SITUATIONS WANTED by two Virginia Ladies to teach in private families English, French, Music, or as companion. Apply to M. McKENNE & SON, University of Virginia. References exchanged.

WANTED—by a Teacher of ten years' experience, a good Latin scholar—a position as tutor, or assistant in a boys' school. Would prefer to teach Latin only. Address J. H. CONVERSE, 246 N. Eutaw Street, Baltimore.

Standard College Text-Books

SELECTED FROM

MACMILLAN & CO.'S

Educational Catalogue.

GREEK.

DEMOSTHENES ON THE Crown, and Aeschines against Ctesiphon. By Bernard Drake, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

HOMER'S ODYSSEY. Books I. to XII. With Notes by the Rev. W. W. Merry, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

HOMER. The Narrative of Odysseus. Books IX. to XII. With a Commentary by John E. B. Mayor. 16mo, \$1 50.

SOPHOCLES. Edited by Lewis Campbell, M.A. Text only. 16mo, \$1 75.

SOPHOCLES. In Single Plays. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by Lewis Campbell, M.A., and Evelyn Abbott, M.A.

EDIPUS TYRANNUS. 75 cents.

COLONEUS. 75 cents.

ANTIGONE. 75 cents.

AJAX. 60 cents.

THEOCRITUS. Idylls and Epigrams. With English Notes by H. Kynaston, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

THUCYDIDES. Sicilian Expedition. (Books VI. and VII.) With Notes by Rev. Percival Frost, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

XENOPHON. Selections. With Notes by J. S. Phillpotts, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

XENOPHON'S ANABASIS. Selections. With Vocabulary and Notes by J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., and C. S. Jerram, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON. By Henry George Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. Sixth edition, revised and augmented. 4to, half-roan, \$12; sheep, \$11.

—The Same, abridged, for Lower Forms. Small 4to, half-roan, \$2 50; sheep, \$1 50.

FOURTH GREEK READER. Specimens of Greek Dialects. With Notes by W. W. Merry, M.A. 16mo, \$2.

FIFTH GREEK READER. Selections from Greek Epic and Dramatic Poetry. With Notes by Evelyn Abbott, M.A. 16mo, \$2.

LATIN.

CÆSAR. The Civil War. With Notes by Charles E. Moberly, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

CÆSAR. The Gallic War. With Notes by Charles E. Moberly, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

CICERO. The Academica. With Notes by James S. Reid, M.L. 16mo, \$1 50.

CICERO. The Orations against Catilina. With Notes by A. S. Wilkins, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

CICERO. The Second Philippic Oration. Edited by John E. B. Mayor, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

CICERO. Select Letters (Text). Edited by A. Watson, M.A. 16mo, \$1 50.

CICERO. Selected Letters. With Notes by C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. 16mo, \$1.

LIVY. Book I. With Introduction and Notes by J. R. Seeley, M.A. 8vo, \$2 50.

LIVY. Extracts from. With Notes by H. Lee Warner, M.A.

1. THE CAUDINE DISASTER. 75 cents.

2. HANNIBAL'S CAMPAIGN IN ITALY. 75 cents.

3. THE MACEDONIAN WAR. 75 cents.

OVID. Selections. With Notes by W. Ramsay, M.A., and G. G. Ramsay, M.A. 16mo, \$1 75.

SALLUST. Catilina et Jugurtha. With Notes by C. Merivale, B.S. 16mo, \$1 50.

TACITUS. The Agricola and Germania. With Notes by A. J. Church, M.A., and W. J. Brodribb, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

LATIN GRAMMAR. By H. J. Roby, M.A. In two Parts. Part I. 12mo, \$2 50. Part II., \$3 50.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

22 Bond Street, New York.

Good Companions for Summer Tourists.

Student Life at Harvard

BY GEORGE H. TRIPP.

12mo, paper, illustrated cover by F. G. Attwood, \$1.

. A cheaper edition of this popular book is now offered to those who like a thoroughly original American novel. The cover illustrations are characteristic scenes selected from the story.

Nimfort.

WAYSIDE SERIES. 16mo, cloth flexible, \$1 50.

At all Bookstores.

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., BOSTON.

Art and Antiquities.

AN ILLUSTRATED LECTURE.

In answer to many requests, Rev. HENRY G. SPAULDING (whose Lowell Institute Lectures have been among the most popular and attractive ever delivered in Boston) has prepared a Lecture for Lyceum Courses. Subject:

Greek Art and Roman Life in Ancient Pompeii.

This lecture will be richly illustrated with the finest Stereopticon views, both plain and colored. Time for New England engagements, Oct. 29 to Jan. 5. Address: Dorchester District, Boston.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Fat and Blood, and How to Make Them.

By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., author of 'Injuries of the Nerves,' 'Wear and Tear,' etc. 12mo, fine cloth, \$1 25.

Memoirs of J. Q. Adams.

Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, comprising portions of his Diary from 1795 to 1848. Edited by Hon. Charles Francis Adams. Vol. XII. 8vo, extra cloth, \$5.

This volume completes this valuable work, and contains an elaborate index to the twelve volumes.

Leeds's United States History.

A History of the United States of America. Including some Important Facts mostly omitted in the Smaller Histories. Designed for General Reading and for Academies. By Josiah W. Leeds. 12mo, extra cloth, \$1 75.

. For sale by Booksellers generally, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of the price by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,
715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

PATENTS.

F. A. LEHMANN, Solicitor of Patents, Washington, D.C. No Patent, no pay. Send for circular.

Try L'AMERIQUE.

The best Cigarette, and just the thing for Summer Smoking. Mixture of PERIQUE and VANITY FAIR.

Only best French cigarette-paper used. Highest Centennial Award. Sample by mail, 15 cents. Ask your dealer for our goods. Five Prize Medals.

WM. S. KIMBALL & CO.,

PEERLESS TOBACCO WORKS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 3050.

NEW YORK.

CUNARD LINE.

ESTABLISHED 1840.

FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL.

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston, once a week.

RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$50, \$100, and \$150, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.

STEERAGE—\$28 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANCKLYN,

4 Bowling Green, New York.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY,

FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60 gold; Steerage, \$30 currency. For freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

To Summer Tourists.

ALLAN STEAMSHIP LINE,

From Baltimore to Halifax, and vice versa.

The A 1 British Royal Mail Iron Screw Steamships
HIBERNIAN, 3,200 tons, Capt. Lieut. Archer, R.N.R.,
NOVA SCOTIAN, 3,200 tons, Capt. Richardson,
CASPIAN, 3,000 tons, Capt. Trocks,
AUSTRIAN, 3,000 tons, Capt. Wylie,
LEAVE BALTIMORE EVERY FORTNIGHT, WEDNESDAYS,

FOR HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

Cabin passage to Halifax, \$20 gold. Round Trip Ticket, \$35 gold.

This opportunity by offering, as it were, an abbreviation of a European trip is exceptionally agreeable to those who desire a change from the usual round of American pleasure resorts.

For further information apply to A. SCHUMACHER & CO.,
South Gay Street, Baltimore, Md.

Liverpool &
London & Globe
Insurance Co.,
45 William St.

Hanover Fire Insurance Co.

120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Capital paid in in Cash.....\$500,000 00
Reserves for all liabilities, including reinsurance.....633,489 45
Net surplus.....509,393 14

Total assets.....\$1,642,882 59

B. S. WALCOTT, President.

I. REMSEN LANE, Secretary.

